

NCUTCD BTC 1/5/2000

Morning: Carrigan, Cusack, Mackay, LaPlante, Li, Moeur, Sorton, Oliver, Petritsch

Afternoon: Li, Cusack, Vogelsang, De Robertis, Oliver, Dressler, Kittle, Petritsch, LaPlante, Moeur, Sorton, Carrigan, Van Houten, McNamara, Fox
Responses to sponsor agency comments:

9A "Shared Roadways" definition - eliminate entirely. Because is unnecessary and is not mentioned anywhere else in chapter 9. Is covered by other publications. Requested as a result of sponsor comments. Unanimous approval.

AASHTO sponsor comments 9A

Caltrans- adding 'SIGNS AND pavement markings" to Bicycle Lane definition . Agree provides clarity. Unanimous,

Idaho DOT recommended removal of Bikeway definition - Rejected: keep definition, is needed to define all types of facilities Unanimous

Shared Use Path definition add "independent alignment" to replace "independent right-of-way" BTC source of request - justification to clarify that such facilities can be provided on land that is not a dedicated r.o.w. Unanimous

Maryland DOT request for shared highway term . Rejected because once designated, it becomes a part of the roadway. Unanimous.

Mass Highway Dept. request to reduce 9A.5 standard to guidance claim that it would require them to adopt laws they don't want. Rejected; no obligation on agency to adopt UVC Unanimous.

BTC decided to change from Standard to Support in order to make congruent with Chapter 1. "have provisions for bicycles and ARE used as the basis for the control..." Unanimous

Minnesota request to delete item (e) regarding in the highway R.o.w. or independent r.o.w. Rejected because want to retain both options for guidance on location. Unanimous.

Minn. DOT request on 3 (f) to reword - Reject and keep existing wording.

Routing must be continuous, not necessarily routes. Routing implies origin and destination. Unanimous.

New Mexico - prefer NPRM wording over BTC. Rejected: BTC prefers existing wording as consistent with AASHTO and other documents. Unan.

Ohio DOT - does not like "specifically designated for bicycle travel"
Rejected - BTC wants term for designated facilities (and not just where not prohibited.) A generic term is needed. Our definition already includes other uses. Unan.

Ohio DOT request to change definition back to bicycle path. Rejected: BTC prefers existing wording as consistent with AASHTO and other documents. Unan.

Virginia DOT note (a) change: rejected - see Ohio.

Virginia DOT note (f) change about directional and route markers. Rejected: would be inappropriate - no requirement to put in informational markers. In order to be designated, must have designations. See section 9B - 19 and 9B-20 for further guidance. Unan.

9B Comments

LAB Richard Moeur Sign sizes for r3-17a, R3-17b and R3-17c should be changed to 24" x 8" to allow for commonly sized sign blank. Agreed - Unanimous.

LAB Alan Wachtel 9B.1 "Shared roadway" delete - Agree - already deleted in 9A making consistent with 9A. Unan.

9B.1 request to Reword 'Signs for the exclusive use of bicyclists...'
Agree, provides clarity. Unan.

9B.4 request to delete "preferential" from bicycle lane definition. Agree to delete from all instances because it is consistent with the definition of bicycle lane in 9A. Unan. (Will also require changes in 9B.9 on page 18 and on page 5/21 in 9C.3 Standard)

9B.6 Wrong Way signs - recommend combine two sentences. Agree - because wording is clearer and more succinct. Unan.

9B.10 Meaning unclear comment - not sure what desired replacement of guidance language is since none provided. Wording is same as in the 88 manual. Rejected Unanimous.

9B.15 Intersection warning signs. Agree to request, but are modifying request to fit the geometry "of intersections on shared use paths." ADD new sentence "This applies to shared use path intersections with roadways or other shared use paths." Provides clarity. Unan.

9B.17 W11-1 sign re-name request from Bicycle Crossing Warning to Bicycle Presence Warning (or similar). Reject because change would conflict with definition in part 2C.36. (BTC notes that this sign is generally used for crossings except when used with Share the Road plaque.) Agree - replace with 2c.36 guidance language - first paragraph. We will replace our guidance statement with new support. The option language remains the same. The standard has added language from 2C.36 (including down arrow). Unan.

9B.19 Reject: does not bother us.

9B.21 Destination sign concern Rejected: Concern is not founded - manual allows for mounting above or below.

NWUTI - Bob Seyfried Conflict with 2C regarding warning signs in advance of intersection AGREE: Need 9B.15 Other Bicycle Warning Signs Guidance statement "Intersection warning signs should not be used when path approach to the intersection has a stop, yield, or signal control. Refer to section 9B.18." Justification - wording from 2C.53 is adapted for this section. Unanimous

AASHTO Alaska Figure 9-2 clarity Agree: diagram was poorly reproduced and text was lost Unan.

AASHTO California Bicycle Warning W11-1 sign re-name request from Bicycle Crossing Warning to Bicycle Warning Reject because change would conflict with definition in part 2C.36. (BTC notes that this sign is generally used for crossings except when used with Share the Road plaque.) Agree - replace with 2c.36 guidance language - first paragraph. We will replace our guidance statement with new support. The option language remains the same. The standard has added language from 2C.36 (including down arrow). Unan.

Metric/English unit usage concern -Agree: will be solved by Edit Committee

AASHTO Delaware Page 13/37 Engineering judgment coverage Reject: we

believe that this is a special enough situation and the present location is the most logical place. Unan.

Page 25/37 request supplemental "Slippery When Wet" plaque Reject: The use of a "Slippery When Wet" plaque is not precluded. Will add an option statement: A supplemental plaque may be used to clarify the specific surface condition. Justification: replaced by an option statement.

Page 26/37 Bicycle Crossing Warning sign inconsistencies Reject: inconsistent with the new 2C.36 and previous practice. The standard has added language from 2C.36 (including down arrow). Unan.

AASHTO Idaho Use of word Bikeway - two occasions Rejected: 1) would be contrary to the new 2A.8 2) Sign referenced is defined for bike paths (not bike lanes)

AASHTO Maine Use of should versus may Accept: will change justification to "ought to"

AASHTO Massachusetts 9B Redundancy concerns Rejected; redundancies are intentional due to likely use of chapter 9 as a stand alone document

9B.1 Sign sizes: Multiple sizes are specified and use. Unan.

9B.3 Roadway should have priority Rejected: shared use trail traffic should not always be required to stop for roadway traffic. Unan.

9B.6 Wrong Way sign concerns Rejected: Wrong way sign is intended for use where there are problems. Unan.

9B.20 M1-9 sign confusion Reject: Would be inconsistent with other FHWA documents, including the standard highway sign book. AASHTO approves the use of this sign. Unan.

AASHTO Michigan Sign Dimensions Reject: Because sign sizes are variable the sign sizes are shown in the table. Unan.

AASHTO Minnesota Reflectivity concerns Reject: Are clarifying reflectivity for bicycle use. Redundancy is intentional due to likely use of chapter 9 as a stand alone document.

Figure 9-1 Metric clearances should exceed English units Reject: values are the result of a hard conversion and are required to approximate and not

exceed. Unan.

AASHTO New Hampshire M1-8 and M1-9 concerns Reject: no advantage to redesigning signs that have been in use for twenty years with no apparent confusion. Unan.

AASHTO New Mexico 9B.2 prefer FHWA version of standard and guidance Reject: no advantage to reverting Sign size was relocated from guidance to standard because it is a standard. Unan.

Figure 9-1 Sign height in hilly conditions Reject: will not provide something so broad that it provides no guidance - engineering judgment should be used. Unan.

9B.8 Mobility priority concern Rejected: shared use trail traffic should not always be required to stop for roadway traffic. Unan.

9B.11 Dimensions Reject: For consistency all signs are defined in the dimension table. Unan.

9B.15 Legend/graphic for narrow bridge Reject: The legend version is no longer defined in Chapter 2 of the manual. Unan.

9B.18 FHWA figure and W11-1 Reject: It is not intended that the W11-1 be used at every path-roadway intersection. It would be burdensome to agencies Unan.

9B.19 Figure 9-3 W11-1 Reject: The W11-1 sign will not be required in the majority of cases. Unan.

AASHTO New York D4-3 Parking sign directional arrow Reject: There is nothing to preclude using this sign as two separate panels. Unan.

AASHTO Ohio Path versus path Reject: This is an Edit Committee comment Unan.

All upper case comments where sign name is also legend Agree: is an Edit Committee comment Unan.

Sign sizes Reject: Refer to sign dimension table Unan.

Interstate bike route sign Reject: This sign is developed and owned by AASHTO - they defined it. Unan.

Page 16 Wrong Way signs Reject: Bicycle Wrong Way is installed only where there is a current problem. Longer wording would not create an advantage. Unan.

Sign cuts Reject: Redundancy is intentional due to likely use of chapter 9 as a stand alone document. Unan.

9B.20 Interstate bike route marker Reject: This sign is developed and owned by AASHTO - they defined it. Unan.

AASHTO Pennsylvania 9B.9 Bike Lane No Parking sign Reject: Already in the manual and in use across the country. No need for change. Unan.

9B.19 D11-1 Bike Route signs Accept: Have added Direction, Distance, and Destination language to guidance on 9B.19. We have eliminated the word "Shared" to bring into accordance with 9A. Justification: Provides better destination guidance for the use of the sign. Unan.

9B.16 Slippery When Wet plaque Reject: The use of a "Slippery When Wet" plaque is not precluded. Will add an option statement: A supplemental plaque may be used to clarify the specific surface condition. Justification: replaced by an option statement. Unan.

9B.17 W11-1 FYG color Reject: Only the W11-1 is used for crossing conditions- therefore, it is the only one that is eligible for FYG color.

AASHTO Utah 9B.2 Awkward sentence in bullet 5 for sign size Reject: This is an exclusive condition for use as a standard (as opposed to bullet seven wording provided as guidance.) Wording is appropriate. Unan

9B.18 W11A-2 sign Reject: W11A-2 no longer exists in the new part 2C (which replaces 9B.18) Unan.

AASHTO Virginia R5-1b Bicycle Wrong Way sign Reject: FHWA has already changed in the 88 manual. Unan.

Page 13 Motor vehicle priority Reject: shared use trail traffic should not always be required to stop for roadway traffic. Unan.

Page 16 R5-1b sign Reject: FHWA has already changed in the 88 manual. Unan.

Page 20 Option for Wrong Way signs Reject: Nothing in the manual precludes back to back sign mountings.

Page 23 W11-1 series signs with R designation Reject: Part 2C of the new manual no longer specifies R and L designations. Unan.

AASHTO Wisconsin 9B.3 Assignment of Priority Reject: While this is a valid concern, engineering judgment should be used for each case. Unan.

9B.10 Use of "only" in option description R9-5. Reject: Because this sign is intended for use where bicycles can only move on the pedestrian phase we will not strike the use of the word "only". Where it is not intended to require the bicyclist to only use the WALK indication, the PUSH BUTTON FOR GREEN LIGHT R10-3 sign may be used. Guidance section - Agree with their comment and have changed the guidance paragraph accordingly. Justification: UVC does not require bicyclists to dismount.

Page 20 9B.11 need for separated paths Rejected: this is a sign that we need to be able to use. It is not required. There are certain instances where separate paths are not practical. Unan.

9B.18 (not 9B.17) Share The Road signs Rejected: FHWA defined this use in January of 1997. We will not reexamine this issue for this manual. There is no consensus on the combination car-bike symbol sign. Unan.

Page 30 Bike Route Guide signs Agree: Have made revisions to 9B.19 guidance language. Unan.

Attachment 14 9C comments

LAB Richard Moeur 9C.3 recommendation Take proposal with standard, change support statements to justifications, add drainage cross-section and maintenance concerns to justifications. Reasons: see justifications. Source: sponsor agency LAB comment. Unanimous.

LAB John Schubert Page 16 of 21 Recommend the deletion of the use of bollards. Agreed. Change Figure 9.6 to "Obstruction" from "post or bollard" in both figure and justification. Add sentence to justification: "Removing all references to bollards so as to not encourage their use unless absolutely necessary - see AASHTO Bike Guide." Unan.

LAB Alan Wachtel 9C.1 Wants loss of traction to be standard, not guidance.

Reject; Technology is not available to make mandatory. Keep as guidance. Unan.

Figure 9-7 Dotted Line concerns. Reject; see no need for change, will continue to show as optional. Unan.

9C.3 "Preferential" term is superfluous. Reject: Keep as is, term is needed for clarification and is therefore desirable.

Figure 9-3 Inverted Word legend concern. Reject: We will continue as is and uphold established, common, engineering practice.

Figure 9-4 concern about end of bike lane stripe. ACCEPT Response: will alter graphics on figure to delete crosswalk markings, change legend "otherwise solid line" goes away, end of bike lane stripe is pulled back. Reason: to actively encourage vehicle/bicycle merging movements at intersections in accordance with current practice. Unanimous

Figure 9-5 double dotted bike lane markings concern Rejected: is optional to begin with. No change is necessary. Unanimous

ATSSA David McKee Bollard concerned about retroreflectorization. Reject: is correctly worded at present. Unan.

AASHTO Alaska 9C.3 concern about "markings designate bike lanes" statement. Reject: too literal interpretation, language is in accordance with Section 3 as is.

Objection to "restricted" bicycle lane. Rejected: there is a legal difference arising to the use of restricted. Will keep restricted designation.

Page 6 Guidance question about the discouragement of a bike lane between right and through/right turn lane. Rejected: needs to be especially discouraged since impractical to have a through lane to the right of a right turn. Motorists will expect a free flow right turn movement. Unan.

AASHTO Idaho Change bikeway to Bike Lane Reject: all facility markings covered by the use of bikeway. Unan.

AASHTO Massachusetts Concern 9C is redundant with chapter 3. Rejected, is not redundant, redundancies that exist on purpose and necessary.

9C.3 two choices for bike pavement markings. rejected: no national agreement is possible on only one symbol.

9C.6 bike symbol concerns Rejected - see above

AASHTO New Hampshire Figure 9-5 concern Rejected: Figure has been deleted - concern is now moot. Unan.

figure 9-5 want additional right turn lane arrow Rejected: The figure is illustrative and is not to scale. Intended purpose of figure is for bike lane purposes. Unan.

AASHTO New Mexico 9C.1 Support concern Rejected: markings are not just mandatory, they define the facility. Justification: change to eliminate mandatory and clarify. Unan.

Standard versus 3A.6 and 3B.12 concern. Reject: the sections are necessary and do apply.

4/21 Support , prefers NPR version Rejected: extraneous information and is not needed.

5/21 Support and Standard - prefers NPR version. Rejected: we believe that it is a good reason and it conforms with UVC. Unan.

6/21 Support, prefers NPR version. Rejected:. First, national concurrence has been reached on these support statements. Second, we believe that it is a good reason and it conforms with UVC. Unan.

16/21 Reflectorized bollards Rejected: bollards no longer defined. Entire obstruction does not need to be retroreflectorized: use engineering judgment. Unan.

17/21 Bollard placement relative to roadway Rejected: no bollards in manual. Not a design issue - see AASHTO Green Book. Unan.

18/21 RR crossing figure Rejected: Figure shows adequate bicycle shopping sight distance to the W10-1. Unan.

19/21 prefers FHWA support and guidance Rejected: 1) insufficient justification provided to support a change 2) Added information is not relevant or useful. Unan.

AASHTO Ohio 9C.6 use of R10-13 sign should be mandatory Reject: the sign is to direct bicyclists to the signal actuation pavement marking. While this sign will be useful when the pavement marking symbol is first installed in a community, engineering judgment should be used to determine its installation. Unan.

AASHTO Pennsylvania figure 9-7 marking and sign concerns 1) AGREE: will define as 'wide dotted line' from 3A.6 at crossing Figure is defined as "OPTIONAL". 2) REJECT: Already states "Use devices as warranted - see 9B.3"

AASHTO Utah Guidance language AGREE: will change to AN optional. Unan.

AASHTO Virginia Page 6 Guidance Reject: already defined by existing wording. Transition rate of 1:25 is already quite generous. Unan.

Page 19 Guidance Reject: Typical width is only two feet which will not cause an abrupt motorist maneuver.

AASHTO Wisconsin 9C.6 Reflectorized concern: Reject: Accepted practice is already to reflectorize for both sides.

choices for images for bike pavement markings. rejected: no national agreement is possible on only one symbol.

Attachment 15 Signals - 9D

LAB - Wachtel Signal Warrant counts Agree: For purposes of signal warrant evaluation, bicyclists can be counted either as pedestrians or vehicles. Unan.

Signal Timing review Rejected: The clearance issue needs an enhanced technology in order to relieve the conflict. While we agree with your concerns, signal timings on all roadways is an issue that we have not been able to achieve a consensus from the National committee on.

AASHTO Alaska 9D.2 Signal Operations for Bicycles Standard Rejected: There is no such implication that bicyclists take precedence or that they have not been taken into account already. Unan.

AASHTO Ohio Bikeway definition Reject: bikeway is defined, and cannot be interpreted to be anywhere.

Pavement Markings TC comments:

Pavement marking specify "Normal white line (3A.6a)" to replace where define bike lane stripe as 6" (150mm) on figure 9-3, 9-4, 9-6 and 9-8. This will allow the use of a 6" stripe without defining it, and will still be in accordance with AASHTO.

Preferential Bike Lane - recommend change to Bike Lane.

Also, figure 9-8 line width concern from BTC. Justification for making a wide line: special situation where safety is of paramount concern, desire to be consistent with PM TC and Chapter 3. Normal could result in only a four inch line. Unan.

Prepare "normal" and "wide" versions for presentation so have alternate for adoption if needed.

Our docket closes on March 24th (unless there is a mid-term meeting)

Support Statement: Raised Devices to define a bike lane can prevent preferred right turn merging maneuvers and can cause problems in cleaning or maintaining the lane.

1/6/2000 Full NCUTCD meeting

9A Check chapter 1 definitions for Shared Roadway and Bicycle Lane

9A Approved

9B.16 W8-10 sign Option/Guidance change all language to OPTION, also replace all uses of should with MAY

9B.17 Standard , when used at the location of the crossing

9B Approved

9C.3 Standard ...to separate bicycle lanes from adjoining travel lanes.

9C.6 Obstructions marked with retroreflectorized materials or appropriate object markers.

Figure 9.9 marking REFERENCE 3A.6

9C Approved

9D Approved

Afternoon

JL Want to set up direct downloads of bike section for comments.
Future manual will be loose-leaf, CD ROM, and Webster.

RM Can upload files to website for review by others. Will need to be
sure that people have the official latest version. Can provide advance copy
in PDF.

TP Can do conference call, with netmeeting support via internet.

CK Will log public comments on Part 9. Public comments are not
responded to. Text must be in final version to their chief counsel by
September. BTC can visit website of comments. March 24th is the deadline
for comments. NPRM term has been changed to Notice of Proposed Amendment
NPA.

CK Have directed field offices to have Washington office decide
experiment requests.

Initiatives:

Roundabouts (both bike and ped.) - TP, CV, AS, SL
Shared Use Arrow- JM, SMcN, Steve Bolt, RVH, TP-research, MDR - SF work
Colored Bike lanes - MDR, BF, JM, BC, Steve Bolt
11/3 car/bike lanes (alternative to 14')
Bicycle Specific Signals - TP, RM, CV, MC
All Pedestrian Phase Crossings, Signal timing, Clearance issue - TP, RM, CV,
MC
Tunnel or Special Area Warning Devices - TO,
Pedestrian Issues - flashing don't walk "don't start" SL, Joe Henderson?, JL
Bike/Bus Lane - MDR (data), Andy Clarke?
Yield pavement marking at mid-block crossings - RVH, JL
Read entire new manual for ped. topics - Bill Fox
Path Crossing Warning sign series - BF, TP, BF, ED,
Advance Bicycle Stop Bars at Traffic Signal - RM, AS, RVH
Peds. in Construction Areas - AS?
ITS issues - RVH, JL
In-Pavement Beacons - BF (data), RM, TP

Bike/Ped/Skate allowed/prohibited signs- JM

MTUCD chapter reviews for bike and ped - determine in June

Gene Putnam, C & M committee

Will go with separate arrows for bike & ped. detour signs

Additional AASHTO comments were provided (after we had gotten NCUTCD approval on 9A, 9B, 9C, and 9D.) Reviewed - nothing of consequence

Peter Rausch will become new BTC chair after June

Websites www.mutcd.fhwa.dot.gov
www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov