

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
National Sign Advisory Work Group  
Meeting Minutes  
8 June 2000**

The meeting began at 0800 in Room 1225 of the Pulaski Building, 20 Massachusetts Avenue West, Washington, D.C. The following attended all or portions of the meeting:

Thomas Sully, CEMVP-ED-ES, (651) 290-5573  
Michael Kidby, CECW-OD, (202) 761-8835  
Timothy Grundhoffer, CEMVP-ED-D, (651) 290-5574  
Henrik Strandskov, CEMVP-CO-TS, (651) 290-5578  
Bill McCauley, CESWD-ETO-R, (214) 767-2434  
George Tabb, CECW-ON, (202) 761-1791  
Debra Stokes, CEMVN-OD-T, (504) 862-1344  
David Johnson, CELRP-OR, (724) 639-9013  
Terry Ramsey, CESAW-JS-OK, (804)738-6144,ex. 110)  
Karlissa Krombein, CECC-K, (202) 761-8546  
Greg Mollenkopf, CENAB-OP-TR, (410) 962-6017  
Janice Sorensen, CENWP-OC (503) 808-4523

**Greetings from Darrell Lewis.** The meeting began with greetings and an inspirational message from Darrell Lewis, Chief of Natural Resources Management Branch, HQUSACE. Darrell emphasized the positive changes over recent years in the Corps recreation and environmental stewardship programs. He noted that these programs had risen greatly in the estimation of upper management. He also pointed out that although our customers - people who recreate at Corps facilities - are consistently satisfied with their experience, we face the continuing challenge of serving an increasingly diverse customer base.

With regard to the sign program, Darrell said that George Tabb will replace retiree Dave Wahus as head of the Recreation Program. George is the Natural Resources proponent of the Sign Program MCX and develops sign program policy. In general, Darrell stressed the importance of signs in the natural resources program. Darrell discussed the team that is currently working on nationwide recreation area standards for Corps recreation areas, and urged that we keep Mike Miller, the team's head, aware of sign standards. George Tabb said he has already made sure the team is cognizant of sign standards.

**Status of the combined Sign Program MCX.** George Tabb and Mike Kidby reported on the status of the combined National Sign Program MCX. The combined MCX will incorporate the functions of the National Sign Standards Program MCX and the Waterway Signs MCX. We have completed the charter for the combined MCX, and we have approval from the civil works military leadership. However, the request for final signature is still pending. We will continue to function as a combined MCX while we await the final approval. Staffing the MCX are Henrik Strandskov, Tom Sully, and Tim Grundhoffer, all of the St. Paul District. It was agreed that all requests for assistance from the MCX should go through Henrik to insure consistency and to make it easier to keep track of MCX activity. Henrik will send a notice to the field that he should be the contact for requests for MCX assistance.

**Special Presentation from Portland District on Jetty Safety and Other Issues.** Janice Sorensen from Portland District gave a presentation. Janice is a tort claims investigator for the district's office of

counsel. She first showed a video of accident problems in Portland District. In one instance, water gushed up out of a big grate in a public viewing area at the Bonneville power project. The water came up at random, and the force of the flow was enough to knock people off there feet. That problem has been fixed, but there is a similar problem at the Ice Harbor project. In another situation, a car had skidded off a wet, metal-surfaced bridge.

Janice also showed slides of the special hazards of the jetties that have been built along the Pacific Northwest coastline. One problem is that logs wash up against the jetties and sand is trapped. Sinkholes form in the sand. All the logs and sand can be, and apparently often are, washed away by the natural force of the waves. The problem can also be corrected using heavy equipment. So Janice would like an emergency (temporary) sign that can be put up while the site is hazardous and taken down when the problem no longer exists.

Another sign-related problem (which was not documented on videotape) was the case of a Russian man who almost drove into the water. Janice noted that they have both Russian and Vietnamese anglers using their projects who do not always understand English-language signs. They fish where they are not supposed and say they can't read the signs or they can't understand the rangers who tell them to move along.

It was noted that Joe Holmberg, former chair of the Sign Advisory Work Group and an expert on Corps signage, is transferring to Portland District and will be able to correct some of their sign problems. One of the projects he will be responsible for is Bonneville.

One incident Janice reported involved some men who were familiar with conditions on the jetties. Nevertheless, they walked out on one of them and were injured when rogue waves washed across its surface. In that case, news reporters noted that the Corps needed better signs. However, one of the problems at most of the jetty sites is that the Corps owns the jetty but none of the shoreland near it. Another problem with jetty signage is that winter storms knock down signs and they wash out to sea.

One problem discussed was that existing Corps brochures suggest indirectly that the jetties can be used in spite of hazards. Janice's main request of the Sign Advisory Work Group is for a symbol sign that really emphasizes the danger of a coastal hazard, especially the jetties. She wants something that will get people's attention, even children and adults who can't read English. Janice suggested the use of the traditional skull and crossbones symbol to denote extreme danger. Karlissa noted that for a sign to be effective in warning children, it must be as simple as possible. Greg Mollenkopf observed there is already an example of a symbol sign that has been created for children—the Mr. Yuck symbol for drug and poison containers. In that case, the introduction of the symbol was accompanied by an intensive educational campaign. We would have to do the same, doing something analogous to our water-safety educational program.

One symbol sign that has been used in the past on jetties and for other coastal hazards is the "high wave" sign. It was pointed out that this is not effective because people see the (temporarily) quiet ocean and don't believe the sign. So-called sneaker waves are a big problem.

A question was raised as to whether use of non-compliant safety signs (such as the "high wave" symbol sign) added to Corps liability in the case of mishaps. Karlissa Krombein, while not condoning the use of non-compliant signs, said that their use had not added to the Corps'

liability in past lawsuits. In every case judges had felt that special site conditions may have warranted the signs.

There was general agreement that we needed more effective use of symbol signs. Both Janice and Tim Grundhoffer gave examples of the acceptance and effectiveness of symbol signs in Europe.

Debra Stokes questioned whether we need the approval of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) approval for new symbol signs? George doesn't think we need such approval, nor does Karlissa. The difference is that these would be our signs for non-road situations. Debra suggested that this be confirmed with the DOT.

Several courses of action were recommended with regard to signage for coastal hazards. Debra will talk to Joe Holmberg about the special problems he will face in Portland District. Henrik will call Tom Hoots and Tom Fake to find out if the National Park Service has signs for dangerous coastal situations. Dave Johnson will check on usable and effective symbol signs that might already exist.

**"Public Recreation Area" signs.** George Tabb brought up another topic. He has had a request from South Atlantic Division to put some sample signs in the manual that designate a Corps site as a "Public Recreation Area." The perceived need for this sign is that visitors who see the Corps logo don't realize that the site is for them and not just for Army personnel. We agreed that this was probably just a problem where there are indeed certain parts of the facility that are reserved as rest and morale areas for soldiers and their families.

**Waterway signs and deadlines.** Mike Kidby discussed the draft memo that Navigation Branch will be sending out. The memo reminds Corps navigation projects of the deadlines for placement of waterway signs, especially safety-critical signs. Mike also discussed a proposed second memo that would describe the option of using daymarks showing Coast Guard symbols. These could be used to complement that regular signage at a site. Because the symbols are visible and understandable at a greater distance than verbal signs, they can be made smaller and therefore more inexpensively. Mike distributed examples of the symbols that can be used on waterway signs and daymarks. The Coast Guard has said that we can use any of their symbols except the ones they are phasing out. Mike was asked when the draft of the guidelines for using Coast Guard symbols will be available for review. Mike said he will make it his highest priority. Henrik noted that the guidance should stress the importance of proper buoy maintenance where buoys were being used to complement signs and/or daymarks.

Later in the day the memo on the applicability of the waterway sign deadlines was signed by Charles Hess; it has subsequently been distributed throughout the Corps. Henrik will put the guidance memos on the MCX website and provide Mike a list of the district sign program managers to send the guidance to.

How will we handle requests for site-specific waivers that will allow the extension of the safety-critical sign deadline to 1 January 2003? Henrik will use the same system he has been using for safety sign waivers, circulating the request first to the field members of the Sign Advisory Work Group, then to the headquarters members. How will the waiver requests be evaluated? Mike and Karlissa will create draft guidelines for evaluating the requests. It was suggested that if lack of money in the past was cited as a reason for a waiver, that project should be able to demonstrate that the signage had been included in past budget requests. Bill McCauley noted that it might not be fair to

require this since some districts have been waiting for guidance on the continued applicability of sign deadlines before budgeting for the signs. Mike pointed out that a district should at least have noted the need for safety-critical signage in its sign plan. Others think that districts have merely been stonewalling. Karlissa noted that we will be looking at delay requests more critically than safety sign legend waivers.

Tom Sully asked whether we would be reviewing the adequacy of a district's sign plan if it requested a waiver. George Tabb and Debra Stokes said we would not. Tim said that in the past, when asked for engineering advice on sign construction, he has given both technical comments and courtesy comments. The courtesy comments might include suggestions about the adequacy of the sign plan. We agreed that this was a good system. However, the courtesy comments must always be advisory only - not formal critiques - because we can't know the project's specifics the way the district personnel do. Tom summarized this point by saying that even if we approve a deadline waiver, we would not be guaranteeing the safety of the plan.

Tim urged that we not be overly hasty in recommending the daymark system to the districts. They are, after all, only a preliminary concept. They have not been sized yet, and we can't ensure uniformity without specifications. He also noted that any project using buoys to complement a signage system can expect large life-cycle costs for the buoy system. The savings with a daymark system come solely from the fact that it costs less to create and erect the smaller sign panel for a daymark as compared with a verbal sign.

George Tabb suggested that we need a visual acuity expert to help us specify sizes for the daymarks. Karlissa Krombein noted that the Coast Guard already has a formula for sizing the daymarks, and we could use that to create our specifications. Mike and Karlissa will get guidance from the Coast Guard and give to Henrik to pass on to Tom and Tim. Henrik will arrange for funds for Tom and Tim to do the technical guidance.

As a final point, Tim asked whether projects can combine the systems? If they use daymarks, must they also use buoys? Karlissa noted that a project can't just substitute the daymark symbols for verbal signs. Not only are buoys likely to be more necessary if there are fewer signs, but a district must make an extra educational effort if relying on daymarks and buoys as a substantial portion of a hazard marking system. If maintenance of a buoy system is a problem, the district must request a waiver.

**Ordering signs from UNICOR.** Janice Sorensen questioned whether it was possible to order signs from local private manufacturers in the case of emergencies. It was that a waiver must be obtained from UNICOR for such a purchase, but that it is quick and easy to get such a waiver. The question of whether private contractors working for the Corps were required to order signs from UNICOR. They are not. What about Operations and Maintenance contractors at Corps lakes? (These are private firms that have a contract to carry out all O&M functions at a Corps recreation area.) In ordering signs, these contractors must adhere to the specifications for Corps signs, but they buy them from any vendor who can meet the specifications.

The ongoing question of high UNICOR prices came up. Tim Grundhoffer noted that if Corps districts would order more signs, UNICOR could get materials in greater volume, which would result in lower material prices and lower sign costs for the Corps.

**Editing, updating, and digitizing the Sign Standards Manual.** Henrik Strandskov described the current process of preparing the sign manual for electronic publication. The initial work of putting the book into a word-processing format is being done by the Publishing Group of the Visual Production Center, Information Technology Laboratory, at the Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC). The contact person there is Jamie Leach, (601) 634-2586. The MCX has provided funding to ERDC for this project.

In January of this year, a subgroup of the Sign Advisory Work Group met in New Orleans to edit the manual. The group consisted of David Johnson, Terry Ramsey, Joe Holmberg, Debra Stokes, and Henrik Strandskov. The manual changes identified by that group are being forwarded to ERDC by the MCX for incorporation into the electronic version of the manual. Dave Johnson is preparing usable versions of the graphics for the digitizing process.

It was suggested that guidance be included in the manual about positioning highly-reflective signs so that they don't blind observers with powerful spotlights. This can be done by angling them so that they are not directly perpendicular to the line of travel or by tilting them slightly forward. Tilting them forward is also recommended by the reflective sheeting manufacturer as a good way to avoid damage by bird droppings.

**Sign Software Upgrade.** Henrik reported that he has completed drafts of the Systems Decision Paper and the Information Technology Investment Portfolio System (ITIPS) document for the software upgrade; these documents are required by the Information Management office at HQUSACE for software projects. He has also begun the contracting process with assistance from Contracting and Information Management personnel at St. Paul District. According to the Contracting staff, it would be impossible to issue this as a sole-source contract, given the nature of the upgrade. Henrik intends to complete the documentation processing and the coordination with his contracting personnel soon. The goal is to have the software developed by the end of the fiscal year, with beta testing and final product ready by the end of the year.

There was discussion of the recent nomination/poll for a name for the upgraded software. The highest vote-getter from a long list of nominations was the name SignPro. This has been used by some commercial products and companies in the past. It was decided to use "Corps Signpro" as the official name; using the word "Corps" in the name should avoid confusion with other uses of the term.

There was a brief discussion late in the meeting as to whether the software upgrade should provide metric and English measurements. Debra recommended against this, and it was noted that metric measurements could probably be easily added if necessary in the future.

**Title 36/Regulation Signs.** New Title 36 regulations have been promulgated and published in a Corps brochure. Progress toward getting a new sign in production was discussed. Henrik distributed a copy of a mock-up of the new sign that had been prepared by Dave Johnson. Some minor changes in the mock-up were agreed to (e.g., an addition to the Table of Contents, adjustment of the red dividing lines). Dave will call Jim Halbeisen at the UNICOR factory and find out what he needs for "camera-ready" copy to begin production.

Next we discussed a request from Greg Miller to change the blue and white "Notice to Visitors" regulation sign on page 12.3 of the manual. This sign lists several especially significant items from the Title 36 regulation, and Greg would like to have different items emphasized. It was agreed that Greg has the option to put those items on the sign that he considers most significant for the project in question. We also agreed that material should be added to page 12.3 stating that the sign can be modified according to site needs. The question was raised as to whether we really need the "Notice to Visitors" sign at all. It was agreed that we should keep it, but we should also make it clear that the sign program manager can use the items from the regulations that are most suitable. The wording should also be reviewed to make sure it matches exactly the Title 36 language.

**Corps brown.** Henrik discussed a recent interagency meeting in the new U.S. Fish and Wildlife training center in Shepherdstown, West Virginia. George Tabb and Henrik met with representatives of the National Park Service and Don Meeker to discuss the brown color used on Federal agencies' signs. The Federal Highway Administration has published a proposal in the Federal Register for new regulations that would specify the acceptable parameters for highway sign colors. The proposed brown parameters do not include some shades of brown that have been suggested as a standard that would be shared by Federal agencies. Also discussed were some possible shades of brown that would be acceptable for this purpose. Don Meeker showed samples in various lighting situations, and two were identified as preferred "candidates" by those attending the meeting. It was agreed that the Park Service would draft a letter of comment to the FHWA about the proposed regulations. The letter would note our concern that the proposed brown parameters might not include the colors we were interested in. Don Meeker would follow up with more precise analysis of the sample colors we had chosen.

**Letter size on directional signs.** New England district had suggested that smaller letters be allowed on directional signs. Debra Stokes said that the district should be reminded that identification of letter size must be preceded by the viewing distance necessary for a given sign. The viewing distance will identify how large the letters must be.

**New sign options.** A new arrow option has been requested. It would be an arrow angled up and to the right. There was general agreement that such an option might be appropriate, but providing it would substantial changes to the manual, software, etc. Henrik was directed to send out a query to see whether that arrow option is needed in enough places to make it worthwhile.

Another new sign option would allow smaller signs by combining elements from existing recommended layouts. The sign requested would apparently be a symbol with distance indicator and arrow, but no text. Dave Johnson noted that at an earlier meeting we had said that we could put text with a parking sign.

Debra warned that granting all these requests for new signs would recreate one of the problems that the sign program was instituted to solve. We would again have an unwieldy, inconsistent, overly expensive assortment of signs at Corps facilities.

**Sign deviations at projects receiving outside funding.** Henrik and Debra reported on a problem in St. Louis District involving the

construction of a new visitors' center that has received some funding from non-Corps sources. These sources have sought to dictate the form and appearance of the entrance, which would deviate substantially from sign program standards. The argument has been that, since they helped pay for it, they should have a say in how it looks.

The immediate and general reaction of the group was that such a request must be unequivocally denied. However, there was a discussion about some of the problems involved. It was noted that the reasons for such a firm denial might be difficult to communicate. One solution is to make clear at the earliest stage of the negotiations that signage is one part of the project that can never be altered from Corps standards. But how then do we please the customer, an important goal for the Corps? After all, we are using other people's money. Yes, but we shouldn't sell our identity, and it is our building. The conclusion was that nothing in the situation warranted deviation from the sign standards program.

That discussion led to a brief discussion of the use of multiple agency logos on signs identifying joint projects. In the revised manual we will specify the following: For projects involving one other agency, the Corps logo will appear left of the legend, and the other agency's logo on the right. For projects with more than one non-Corps partner, all the logos will be spaced across the bottom of the sign.

**Corps signature on directional signs.** Henrik brought up the subject of the prohibition on using the Corps signature on directional signs. Some have felt that this prevents a good opportunity to fulfill the current emphasis on creating a positive brand image for the Corps. Terry Ramsey agreed that the idea had merit.

George Tabb pointed out that there had been good reasons for this rule, noting that using the signature on these signs would result in having more than one message per sign, thus violating an important principle of the sign standards program. George said he was therefore strongly opposed to lifting the prohibition.

It was noted by some that the National Park Service has been placing their logo on interstate highway directional signs at various places in the East. This seems to be an effective way of informing the public of their facilities and promoting the agency. Henrik was asked to check with the Park Service to see how they got permission to use their logo on the interstate highway signs. Are there new rules, for instance, allowing this. Do they only apply to the Park Service? We should also check on how the Forest Service uses its logo on highway signs.

One problem is the positioning of our logo on directional signs. Currently it would occupy the same position as the arrow on most signs. It was noted that ultimately mock-ups of such signs would be needed before any final decision could be made.

The issue was left with a recommendation that preliminary research could be done with other agencies who use their logo on highway directional signs.

**Foreign language signage.** Some in the Corps have objected to the permissibility of foreign language signage in the sign standards program. They cite the difficulty in deciding which languages to use, problems with ensuring meaningful translations, and so forth.

The group was in agreement that the use of foreign language signage is a local decision - both whether to use and what to use. Local sign program managers should be reminded to have a local speaker

of the language in question review the final language of proposed signage to make sure it meets the needs of the particular community being served. Also, we can remind staff that, as stated in the sign manual, the use of symbol signs is encouraged wherever possible.

We were reminded that UNICOR can't provide translations and must be told exactly what wording to use when we order a foreign language sign.

Karlissa Krombein strongly advised against using foreign language translations of the Title 36 regulations. (This last point has apparently caused confusion because Office of Counsel's statement about this some years ago was interpreted to apply more broadly than just to Title 36.)

**Use of signs required for Active Army facilities.** Sign Program Manager Rachel Garren has reported difficulty in dealing with her district security officer, who says that Army regulations require "keep out" signage worded differently from the signs available in the manual. The officer has cited language that says the conflicting regulations apply to "active Army" facilities, and that term includes all Corps facilities.

Karlissa said that Corps facilities are absolutely not "active Army," by definition. Our facilities are "civil works" facilities, and the list of what is included in the term active Army doesn't include "civil works."

Henrik will inform Rachel Garren.

**Signs prohibiting archaeology digging.** We have had requests for elaborate symbol and text signs prohibiting archaeological digging. Terry Ramsey said that another problem is that throughout the country Corps archaeologists are saying that we have to post archaeological areas with an abundance of signs stating what the penalties are.

George Tabb noted that we don't have the personnel to enforce these penalties. The archaeological law ARPA says that others have the enforcement responsibility.

It was suggested that our posting of the Title 36 rules should be enough. Our district archaeologist is responsible for enforcing other laws.

Paul Rubenstein, CECW-AG, the Corps top archaeologist, joined the meeting to talk about marking archaeology sites. Terry described to him his situation, where his district archaeologist is asking that a 75-acre archaeological area be marked with many signs. We also asked Paul whether we need a standard sign for these situations.

Paul noted that prohibition signs can stress three different things to convince visitors not to disturb the site. These are education, the penalties for disturbing the site, and the fact that the site is a unique resource. For all of three of them, the point is that the visitor had better not disturb the resource.

Paul said there is no requirement to post a site. However, the sign advisory work group could decide to come up with a standard sign.

Paul recommended that, under some circumstances, we should tell the public that this is a unique resource that should not be damaged. He stressed that we should consider different kinds of signs. For instance, a small sign with a lot of words won't work; it will be used for target practice, and people won't read it anyway. He said that Paul Nickens at WES had done a report ten years ago about the most effective signs for eliminating disturbance at archaeological sites.

The report concluded that, for the average person, the "unique resource" argument is the most effective.

Courts have always said with regard to archaeological resources, ignorance is not an excuse. No judge has said that a federal agency's lack of signage does not lessen the culpability of a person who has damaged archaeological resources.

Terry asked that Paul give us language that we can put on a Notice sign. Paul said he has tried to find a middle ground in signage language and thinks we need to educate. Henrik was asked to see whether the Park Service has a good interpretive sign on this subject.

**UNISTRUT support posts.** There has recently been a request to the MCX for information about UNISTRUT brand support posts. This is a system of sign post construction that involves the use of rectangular steel tubes. The main support post is inserted into a slightly larger piece that has been placed in the ground.

Henrik showed a sample of such a post he had received from the manufacturer and described a recent demonstration he had attended of actual sign installations using UNISTRUT posts.

It was noted that the sign standards program specifies 4x4 square wooden posts in general, and that the UNISTRUT posts would not be an acceptable substitute. However, it was also observed that the square, tubular UNISTRUT posts are much more nearly suitable than the u-channel metal posts that are so commonly used for roadway signage.

Tim Grundhoffer suggested that the sign manual, in Appendix B, does specify tubular posts for some circumstances, and that in these cases the UNISTRUT system would be acceptable. (Note: It appears that the specification of tubular posts in the manual is only for the installation of some waterway signs. The recent question about using UNISTRUT-type systems is primarily about the installation of traffic signs at recreation projects.)

It was agreed that it might be appropriate to tell sign program managers that UNISTRUT-type systems can be used, but only for single-post traffic signs. However, before any guidance is issued, the Natural Resource Management Branch should be consulted to determine the extent to which this is a policy issue. (Policy changes cannot be implemented by the MCX.)

**Safety signs.** Henrik noted that in some cases the safety manual and the sign manual are not consistent. These discrepancies should be corrected in the next update of the safety manual. We should determine when the next update will be, and then coordinate changes with the Safety Office. Debra will call Dennis Wallace and ask him to coordinate the safety manual update.

What about site-specific safety signs? Debra has sent comments to the MCX about the strengths and weaknesses of the existing signage. When the work group reviews the changes in manual, we should be considering whether there is a need for more such signs, e.g., eye wash signs.

**Playground signs.** The MCX received a question about the use of manufacturer-supplied warning/advisory signs and stickers that come with factory-built playground systems. The example shown was one that advised adults to monitor the children's play and told what ages could appropriately use the equipment. If notices such as these are placed, are they signs? Or are they labels and thus not subject to the sign

standards program? In other words, if they are labels, then they are just part of the purchased equipment.

One problem/objection that was voiced was the concern that we would be acting too much as "big brother" trying to control parents' and children's' use of our facilities.

It was recommended that Office of Counsel be consulted on this issue.

**Chamber marker signs.** Another question that has been raised to the MCX is whether 6-inch letters on the lock chamber marker signs are acceptable. (The sign manual currently gives the option of 9-inch or 12-inch letters.) It was determined that the input of HQ Navigation Branch was needed on this question.

**Sign to recognize volunteers.** Do we have an adequate sign to recognize volunteers at Corps facilities? It was noted that the Corps is using more and more volunteers, and this may require a standard sign. Debra noted that she has been using the Participation Credit sign with language along the lines of: "This area is maintained by . . . ." It was suggested that the challenge cost-sharing regulation prohibits the use of signs. Debra will check the regulation.

**U.S. fee area signs.** A suggestion has been made that we introduce a freestanding U.S. fee area sign. There was agreement that it's not really needed.

Terry Ramsey suggested that a new sign is needed showing it's a "by park" fee. The sign would, for instance, inform visitors that there is a \$2.00 day-use fee. Dave Johnson will do a mock-up of such a sign and pass it by Terry when they meet in July. Dave will send a copy to Debra and Henrik.

**Holes in sign panels.** A question has come up that the mounting holes in UNICOR-manufactured signs are not in the same positions. Tim Grundhoffer noted that they should be the same, and this is a quality-control problem for UNICOR. However, as Dave Johnson observed, the sign manual does not provide specifications for hole placement. It was agreed that we need a chart/formula added to the manual about sign-hole placement. Debra urged that this be kept simple. Tim volunteered to come up with instructions for hole placement.

**Miscellaneous concerns.** Greg Mollenkopf led a discussion of various issues raised by New England District.

One concern was the labeling of park ranger vehicles. This is a graphics standards issue and the policy decisions have already been made by others. A new EP will be coming out.

There had been a suggestion that different colors should be used for different offices. There was agreement that this should not be done.

Should there be a new policy letter by the new chief in the sign manual? This will be done as part of the manual update after we get a new chief.

There is no discussion of trail signs in the manual. Greg will ask the district about their needs.

There was a request for new symbols; for instance, personal watercraft and rollerblades. It was noted a constant desire for new symbols leads to the question: "Where do we stop?" We should

therefore be extremely prudent when considering the addition of new symbols. Terry also pointed out that sometimes the use of words is the only thing that works.

There was a perceived need for signs on the front of bird boxes. These can be stenciled on or other materials can be used. It is beyond the scope of the sign program.

Greg Mollenkopf will coordinate with New England District on these issues.

A final item under the "miscellaneous category" is the sliding reservation sign. We must make sure the specifications in Volume 2 are correct and give an example in Section 7 of Volume 1.

**Sign Advisory Work Group composition.** It was noted that Joe Holmberg has transferred to Portland District, and that there is therefore a need for a new representative from South Atlantic Division on the Sign Advisory Work Group. The MCX will provide the HQ proponents with a model letter to send requesting from that the division designate a new member for the work group.

We must also get formal approval for the membership of Tom Sully and Tim Grundhoffer on the work group.

It was decided that we should also request formal approval for the continued membership of Joe Holmberg, whose extensive background in the sign program has been, and will continue to be, of great value. We can use the same letter we used to retain Debra Stokes to request from Joe's commander Joe's continued presence.

**Next meeting.** It was determined that we should consider allowing a day and a half for the next meeting, which will be held in December 2000.