

Sign Advisory Work Group Meeting Minutes

25-27 October 2011, Lompoc, CA

Attendance: Jeff Mangum, Rick Magee, Debra Stokes, Mike Kibly, Heather Lawler, John Derby, Duane Johnson, Jack Nichol, John Tenny, Steve Logan.

Jeff welcomed the group and hosts, Doug Pecyna and Dean Osborn .

25 October Notes

Update from HQ by Debra:

- Corporate HQ reviewing need to update manual and other regulations. No change to sign manual forms for now.
- Mike Ensich will be retiring at the end of the year.

Update from MCX by Rick:

- SignPro
 - Contract is closed. Peter has been locked out for 2.5 years. Questions are being raised about SignPro from the Corps IT leadership. SignPro is an automated information system (AIS) program and therefore questioned. The questions are security and budget related. Our concern is SignPro is the most critical tool of our Sign Program and it isn't working right so we need to get it maintained. We can't get clearance for the contractor to work on it because of the security and budget related issues.
 - What do we do if SignPro is prohibited? It is a web-based program and cannot exist on a stand-alone PC. Dean suggested possible use of the Adobe Illustrator as used by the National Park Service.
 - ACE-IT doesn't have anything to do with SignPro.
 - Jeff – can we contract with a private contractor for them to have the program on a private server?
 - Debra – **ACTION ITEM:** Need a list of “need to do's” and determine a timeline. We need a “white paper” on the whole situation and send to Mary Coulombe (Rick - draft due to Debra 16 DEC).
 - Jeff – we need a technical “champion” for SignPro.
- MCX/SAWG Charter. Debra asked that the review be done with “track changes” and sent out to the group for a ten-day review. **ACTION ITEM:** Rick will get the proposed revision to the group by the week of 21 November.
- 2012 Sign Workshop. Location will possibly be on the West Coast. John Derby has volunteered to have it in Seattle District. July and August will be the best timeframe. Debra mentioned there is a cap on meetings, but this is training. **ACTION ITEM:** Rick and John will work together on this and propose to Mary Coulombe by 30 NOV. The group is to send them any topics for inclusion.

April 2011 Action Item Review by Jeff:

- Floating mooring bitt – Mike – Sent summary of each district's handling of use of these mooring bitts. The majority indicates no problem because users are being instructed by lock operators. Sign may not be needed since operators are instructing boaters. **ACTION ITEM:**

Sign Advisory Work Group Meeting Minutes

25-27 October 2011, Lompoc, CA

Mike is to check with IMTS Work Group to determine what guidance is needed, if any, and report to SAWG by 23 NOV.

- Universal no jumping/diving symbol: John/Jeff – **ACTION ITEM**: Jeff is to compile work group findings and send to Rick by 10 NOV. Rick will send an approval memorandum to HQ.
- “At Your Own Risk” – **ACTION ITEM**: Debra stated memo to the field must be issued to ensure old jetty signs with this wording be replaced. Rick, Mike, and Debra need to collaborate on the wording of the message from Mike Ensich to the field on replacement of “At Your Own Risk” jetty signs. Lifeguard sign to be changed to simply read “No Lifeguard”. Provide guidance to field on existing lifeguard signs.

Conference Call with Karl:

- ISO/ANSI signs – no changes. OSHA budget is being rolled back.
- SDA-04 – Rick should put “matches” back in.
- SDA-21 – Confined spaces have to be marked. **ACTION ITEM**: SAWG should develop an example of a Notice sign for non-permitted confined spaces for Gateway and current manual revision.
- Radon Warning – There is a label in the safety manual. There is no national standard. Our manual does not allow symbols for Danger-Warning-Caution signs.
- High Voltage signs - Karl recommends specifying voltage value.
- Duane – sign for cold water; did not resolve and decided it wasn't necessary.
 - Karl – do we have a sign that shows class type rapids – NO.
- Gate marking – Jeff/Karl – HQ Safety Office issued a guidance memo on Monday to follow MUTCD gate marking specifications. The USFS gate marking method proposed by Jeff in April does not meet MUTCD specs.

Conference Call with Milt:

- “At your own risk” signs – need to transition out of that verbiage. **ACTION ITEM**: Milt will send email summary of issue to group.
- Contracts regarding approach directional signs – when states require Fed to pay the state's contractor with installing and maintaining directional signs – need to work with local Contracting and Office of Counsel divisions. **ACTION ITEM**: Milt will send email summary of issue to group.
- Security signs – Milt said there is a new Army Reg that states an area must be designated as restricted for it to fall under the sign posting requirements. Milt suggested that if there are any specific security sign issues, they be elevated to him for an opinion.
- Update on court case (drowning over submerged dam in CA) – Corps prevailed in 9th Circuit court, but plaintiff is elevating to Supreme Court.

April 2011 Action Item Review by Jeff (continued):

- Use of Corps Mark decal on Approach Directional Signs – Steve presented photos from SAD pilot program. Group noted inconsistency in placement. **ACTION ITEM**: Jeff will clarify placement paragraph and provide diagrams by 31 JAN 2012, in the event use of decals is approved nationwide.

Sign Advisory Work Group Meeting Minutes

25-27 October 2011, Lompoc, CA

- Cell phone tags – no further requests on this issue, no action needed at this time.
- Glare reduction memo – posted on Gateway? Yes. Section 14 to be revised with this info.
- Glare-reducing acrylic overlays – Tim inspected in August. **ACTION ITEM:** Tim should report findings to group by 30 NOV.
- Recreation symbols. Debra contacted SEG D, but found they are ambivalent on meeting our goal of insuring symbol design consistency. Rick pointed out that Peter Reedijk designed our original symbols when he was working for Don Meeker and maybe he is the best resource to evaluate our new symbols and revise as necessary. **ACTION ITEM:** Rick is to talk with Peter about a cost estimate for this before Thanksgiving.
- John Derby: sign defects at Albeni Falls Dam – beyond warranty, will let stay as is. Podcast symbol is a non-issue, no one pursuing. Presented photos of non-compliant Workplace Safety signs in powerhouses – Debra stated we can't force OM's to comply with sign manual and recommended documenting deficiencies through chain of command.

Other Issues:

- Interpretive Signs
 - We don't want to require the Corps mark on interpretive signs, but we don't want to discourage. This brought about a bigger discussion about the use of the Corps Mark within the interior of Corps property. **ACTION ITEM:** Revise manual sections 4 and 13 to allow use of the Corps Mark when appropriate.
 - Credits for photos – don't normally do that and it is not done when the photographs are taken by an employee during the course of their duties. The only time we give credit if picture was provided by a commercial source or when it has historic significance, e.g. Mathew Brady was the photographer. **ACTION ITEM:** Rick will revise Section 13 to clarify.
- Sign for visually impaired – Rick – no action until required. **ACTION ITEM:** John Derby will contact Pep Persio to get his perspective on accessibility issues.
- Reflectivity test kits: to determine if traffic signs have proper reflectivity per MUTCD. **ACTION ITEM:** Agencies have until January 2012 to establish and implement an assessment or management method to maintain minimal levels of reflectivity. Rick will prepare draft action plan and distribution memo for Chief of Operations signature and submit to HQ for review NLT 4 NOV.

26 October Notes

Other Issues (continued):

- Discussion of group succession and charter revisions. No term limit for group members, allow group to make decisions as we go. Charter revision to include information on make-up of group; experience required – generally need 5 years of Corps experience and 2 years of sign program experience, or a demonstrated knowledge of sign program.
 - The question arose as to whether the national sign program manager must remain in St. Paul. Debra noted the reason the MCX is in St. Paul is because of the waterway sign engineering expertise, the proximity to 3M, and a directive from General Genega that the position should be in the field, not HQ.

Sign Advisory Work Group Meeting Minutes

25-27 October 2011, Lompoc, CA

- Sign Manual Volume 1. Jeff recommended reducing the electronic document size by replacing jpg images with vector images to lessen memory size. If small enough, the entire manual could be a single PDF, and easily searchable.
- Section 18 – office interior – do we need this section since it is not used that much?
ACTION ITEM: Group agreed to change to more generic guidelines.
- Rick advises that if local procurement uses another sign maker other than UNICOR, quality assurance is on them. Should we make this guidance clearer? Yes.
- We must be sure not to delete information about the sign program on the Gateway.
- Volume 2 – extensively reviewed by John Derby and associates.
- Began reviewing sections of Volume 1 prior to and after lunch.

27 October Notes

Tour of Sign Factory. See John Tennery's notes, attached.

Lompoc Sign Factory
SAWG and UNICOR Meeting Notes
27 October 2011

Attendees:

Lompoc Factory: Doug Pecyna, Jose, Ben, Dean Osborn, Mike York

Corps: Debra Stokes, Rick Magee, Jeff Mangum, John Derby, Jack Nichol, Mike Kidby, Steve Logan, Duane Johnson, Heather Lawler, John Tennery

Question: At one time UNICOR published a catalog of sign prices, will they publish one again? (Rick)

Answer: Since prices can change quickly for a variety of reasons, UNICOR hopes to come out with a basic price per square foot for estimating purposes. There will be variables for z-bars, substrates, etc, but folks will be able to have an estimate for budgeting purposes. (Doug)

Comment: Debra pointed out that this would be most critical for purchases with end-of-year funding.

Comment: Jeff pointed out that this wouldn't be a problem if projects would get their sign orders in early. Doug commented that a lot of projects will submit an order but are then changing it based on budget availability. Because of this, the factory has to refigure a lot of the quotes. Changes are identified as Change A, B, C, etc and the most changes they have done to one quote is Change K.

Question: Duane asked about how many orders the factory received that were paid with Visa versus government contract. The question was asked because of the time consuming process to order through contracting.

Answer: Ben responded that approximately 70% of the orders are on Visa cards.

Question: During our walk-through of the factory, we saw several signs being manufactured that were not compliant with the sign manual. How do we ensure that sign orders are compliant prior to them being sent to the factory? (Debra)

Discussion: Duane stated that field offices should send the sign orders through the district sign manager for review and approval prior to the order being sent to the factory. The question came up about how the factory can ensure the sign order are reviewed since, many times, the projects work directly with the factory on non-standard signs. , Based on what was seen in the factory today, Doug stated they will now require approval signatures on the order form before signs are manufactured. Debra stated that we (the Corps) need to re-educate our field managers on the process of obtaining approval for a sign order. Rick stated that a lot of the problems with non-compliant signs are that many of the orders come from Regulatory, E&C, or other offices outside

of Ops that don't know about the sign program or manual. Debra stated the factory cannot make a non-compliant sign no matter who approves it. Rick stated that if the sign is compliant, then the factory should start the process even if the district sign manager has not signed off on it. Doug stated that if something is blatantly outside of specifications, he will let Ben know they need to get with the district sign manager to obtain approval. Ben stated that he had tried this in the past but sometimes he has trouble getting responses to his calls or emails. He just wants to know what is reasonable in his attempts if no one will get back with him. He needs our help to make this work.

Doug also pointed out that, on the summary page of the quotes, the orderer will see any notes that indicate any changes made to the signs in the order. In response to a question, Ben added that most sign orders (90%) are submitted in SignPro.

Question: We are working on an update of Volume II of the sign manual. Is there something they have seen in the manufacturing process that needs to be changed in the manual? (Debra)

Answer: Ben stated sign PS-100 has different graphics in SignPro and in the manual. One has a bottle and the other has a martini glass. It needs to be changed in SignPro. Also, the 3" and 4" slat sign panels are the same size in SignPro (**not sure about this one**)

Jose pointed out that they have had orders for the Boat Ramp and Fee Area Entrance signs where projects have flip-flopped messages on the signs. He stated that this costs time and money to reformat the standard sign and it can delay shipping of an order. For entrance signs, the factory was ok'ed to send new numbers and backing for price changes instead of requiring that a new sign be made.

Question: Is there anything that needs to be added to or subtracted from Volume II of the Sign Manual? (Rick)

Answer: Ben stated that the more manufacturing specifics we can have in Volume II, the better for building signs and finding answers to questions he has.

The issue of painting the backs of signs came up and Dean asked that something be sent to the factory stating they were not required to paint the backs of signs anymore.

Rick reiterated the factory cannot make changes to Danger, Warning and Caution signs.

Question: For Partner Signs, what does the factory need to create partner logos for the sign? (Debra)

Answer: Ben stated that they really just need better artwork for the logo. He said that, many times, he goes online to find the agency website to get the logo because what is submitted with the order is not adequate.

Comment: Ben stated that on some of the sign order worksheets, the projects do not enter the number of signs needed. Rick replied that the orderer must enter at least \$1.00 as the cost of the

signs to be able to save the number of signs on the SignPro sign order work sheets. This is a glitch in the software.

Comment: Doug stated that they have a lot of Alupalite sign material that is approximately 36" X 46" left over from signs ordered by the Park Service. Alupalite normally costs about \$4/foot but he will offer it at the same cost as .080 regular aluminum (\$2-3/foot) for signs he can manufacture with the smaller pieces. He said it can be used for traffic control signs, No Trespassing signs, etc. He also stated that HDO costs about \$3/foot.

Comment: Doug stated that Avery and 3M diamond grade sheeting are both ok to use. He said that there will be lines on the Avery product but they do not affect reflectivity.

Comment: Doug agreed to work with us on Volume II with the assistance of Ben and Jose.

Comment: Jeff stated that to limit file size he will look into removing the grids around signs in Volume I of the manual except for those on the pages for the examples of Grid 1, Grid 2 and Grid 3. He will also attempt to use smaller graphics throughout the manual as long as it doesn't impact readability.

Comment: Doug asked that any emails sent to the factory be sent to Mike York and him.

Taskers:

1. Jack will send old sign quote sheets to Doug.
2. Doug will provide Jack with a list showing what hardware comes with which signs. Jack will send the list to the members of the SAWG for distribution to the field offices.
3. We will share the meeting notes with Doug.
4. We will provide a copy of the policy letter to Doug that eliminates the requirement to paint the backs of signs. Letter should be on Gateway.
5. Doug will look into the availability of HDPE in Corps Brown and Communication Red.

Sign Advisory Work Group Action Items

25-27 OCT 2011 ~ Lompoc, California

Action	By	Due	Done
Discuss solution to Duane's cold water hazard sign	Duane	10/27/11	
*Provide written opinion on use of "at your own risk" wording on signs	Milt	11/4/11	
*Provide written advice on state DOT contractual issues for approach roadway directional signs.	Milt	11/4/11	
Call Pep Persio to learn status of ADA program as it relates to signs for the visually impaired	John D.	11/4/11	
Write memo with written plan for addressing MUTCD traffic sign reflectivity compliance and submit to Debra for signature	Rick	11/4/11	
*Submit SAWG comments on no jumping/diving symbol to Rick for submission for approval	Jeff	11/10/11	
Email draft MCX/SAWG Charter to SAWG for comment	Rick	11/21/11	
*Check with IMTS Work Group to determine what mooring bitt guidance to post on Gateway, if any	Mike	11/23/11	
Get estimate from Peter Reedijk to review new symbols and revise as necessary to be consistent with original symbol design standards	Rick	11/23/11	
Coordinate Sign Program Training Workshop with Mary Coulombe	Rick	11/30/11	
Add invasive species sign recommendations to Gateway (change REG-CS example from "Corps office or personnel" to "Corps of Engineers office")	Rick	11/30/11	
*Report findings of field inspection of acrylic overlays on waterway signs to reduce glare	Tim	11/30/11	
Issue memo to remove all jetty signs with "at your own risk" wording	Rick/Debra	12/5/11	
Post non-permit confined space Notice sign on Gateway (and include in next manual revision of Section 11)	Rick	12/16/11	
Write paper on SignPro problems and submit to Mary Coulombe	Rick	12/16/11	
*Revise Gateway security page to include guidance on AR 190 application to civil works projects NOTE: In progress.	Rick	1/15/12	
*Revise "placement" paragraph in the guidance for Corps Mark decals on approach roadway directional signs to be clearer, and provide supporting diagrams	Jeff	1/31/12	
*Remove "Swim at Your Own Risk" from SWM-01 Remove "Ride at Your Own Risk" from WRN-15	Rick	Next rev.	
*Revise sign manual page 4-2 and section 13 to allow optional use of Corps Mark on interpretive signs	Rick/Pat Barry	Next rev.	
Revise sign manual section 13 with guidance on photo and graphic credit on interpretive signs	Rick	Next rev.	
Revise section 18 office interior signs to be more general guidelines	Rick	Next rev.	
*Update sign manual section 14 with glare reduction guidance	Tim/Mike	Next mtg	

*carry over from April 2011 meeting