

NCUTCD Bicycle Technical Committee Minutes

Wednesday, January 8, 2014, Arlington, Virginia

Prepared by John S. Allen, reviewed by members of the Bicycle Technical Committee

Attendance

BTC members (See <http://www.ncutcdbtc.org/members.html> for affiliations.)

Richard Moeur, Chair	Dwight Kingsbury
John Allen, Secretary	Peter Koonce
John Ciccarelli	Dan Lang
Mike Coleman	Theo Petritsch
Ted Curtis	John Schubert
Josh deBruyn	Bill Schultheiss
Bill DeSantis	Lee Stuart
Cindy Engelhart	Craig Williams
Bill Fox	Mighk Wilson
Michael Jackson	

Guests

*Prospective member

Dongho Chan, City of Seattle*	Charles Meyer, Colorado DOT
Andy Clarke, LAB	Phil Miller, APBP
Mike Cynecki, Lee Engineering*	Rock Miller, Stantec*
Kevin Dunn, FHWA	Ginny Sullivan, Adventure Cycling *
Jim Kalchbrenner, Pexco/Davidson	

Call to Order

Richard Moeur called the meeting to order at 1:05 PM

Approval of Minutes

June 2013 Minutes were approved by acclamation.

Administrative Issues

Every 2 years at the first even-year meeting, the membership of all Technical Committee members is up for renewal at the discretion of the Chair and Board. Richard Moeur recommended to the Board that all BTC members be renewed except for: David Gleason, John Ciccarelli, and John LaPlante.

There are 2 new members up for approval at the Wednesday evening Board meeting, Rock Miller and Mike Cynecki. Mr. Miller is a non-government employee, and Mr. Cynecki is an "emeritus" government employee (26+ years at City of Phoenix). With this change, we are 12 government and 12 non-government members. The rules are that a technical committee shall consist of 50% government members plus one. We need one more government member before we can have more non-government.

We need one or more delegates to attend the Research Committee, which meets Thursday evening. Dwight Kingsbury will attend.

A Pedestrian Task Force meeting is scheduled for this evening, followed by a joint Signals and Bicycle Technical Committee meeting to finalize draft MUTCD content for bicycle signals.

Schedule for Next Edition of the MUTCD

The FHWA MUTCD team attended the Chairs meeting this morning. Chung Eng from FHWA said that any content for the next MUTCD has to be to FHWA by this summer, which means out of technical committees and to sponsors this spring, and approved by the June 2014 meeting. There is a possible notice of proposed rulemaking later this year; maybe comments later, and sometime in 2016 a new MUTCD edition.

Because of the amount of work, the January and June 2015 meetings will run for 4 days; maybe also the June 2014 meeting [as was confirmed later]: June meeting continues into Saturday, January meeting starts Tuesday. There will be 3 days of TC meetings, and these may run all day.

Schultheiss: is getting mixed messages about whether or not there is to be new content.

Fox: what if we don't get it in?

Dunn: other stakeholders might contribute. BTC is special because there are advocacy groups clamoring. Content will be furnished in February, *not* 2 weeks before the June meeting.

BTC has the most placeholders (issues to be developed as MUTCD content) but other TCs have issues with reorganizing content.

We can make big changes now: that is easier than in rulemaking. Lee Billingsley advised committee chairs to give the BTC time on their agendas to present joint proposals and be flexible at this meeting. If we can't get items to sponsors this cycle, we can develop them as BTC proposals but then they don't have the status of "NCUTCD-approved", and only represent the submitting TC. Full review is important to get concurrence; if not, a proposal is either rejected or tabled.

If we have time, we still need to look at the MUTCD draft in general. The comments would be directly to FHWA. This is important.

BTC has nothing from other TCs now but there are discrepancies in proposals for colored pavement. Markings TC is developing all content on colored pavement with BTC input.

We have till close of business tomorrow to draft new proposals. We need to develop the proposals first, but then we should ask whether they need to be in the MUTCD or could be in other technical guidance.

Dunn: All placeholders should be devices. Cycle tracks aren't devices.

Schultheiss: maybe deal with specific features?

Fox: make important changes, avoid wordsmithing in the meeting.

GMI doesn't have much work – Proposals to that TC go out first.

Work on Proposals

Park and Ride Signs

Proposal was prepared by DeBruyn. The discussion was rephrased to be more general and there was a discussion of the design of the sign. Pictographs might be used at bike-share stations, transit stations etc.

Jackson: Portland, Maine bus stops have a sign showing the front of a bus with a bike rack to indicate that there is a rack on the bus.

More wordsmithing was done on this proposal, resulting in version 0.4 to go to GMITC [proposal was denied by GMITC.]

Non-numbered Bike Route Signs

This was a placeholder in the FHWA Part 9 draft for a new "Non-Numbered Bikeway Route Marker" sign. The M1-8 local and regional bike route marker was approved in June 2011. It gives the state, and word or pictograph route designation for numbered routes. But now people want non-numbered ones. Richard Moeur drafted a proposal. The sign will be very similar to the M1-8, M1-8a, and M1-9 (US bicycle route).

This proposal modifies section 9B.21, which was previously modified by NCUTCD to add the new versions of the M1-8 and M1-8a. This proposal will add a M1-x non-numbered route sign to this section. Sign sizes are larger on roadways than on paths because motorists need to see them even to see that they don't apply. The BTC discussed and approved the proposal. [GMITC concurred and the proposal goes out to NCUTCD sponsors. Proposal as approved by BTC and GMITC may be seen at <http://www.ncutcdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/nonnumbbikeroute.doc>.]

Except Bicycles Warning Plaque

The proposal had been prepared by Bill DeSantis. This plaque is similar to one already approved by NCUTCD for regulatory signs, only it is for warning signs such as DEAD END, NO OUTLET, etc. with a black legend and yellow background. One application is for a dead-end street with a cut-through for bicyclists, a so-called "live-end street." This sign can be adapted to work zones by making the background orange. The BTC approved the proposal. [RWSTC concurred and this goes out to NCUTCD sponsors. Proposal as approved by BTC and RWSTC may be seen at <http://www.ncutcdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/exceptbikeswarn.doc>.]

Bicycle Lane Intersection Control Sign

This was a placeholder in the FHWA Part 9 draft for "Bicycle Intersection Lane Control Signs". Bill DeSantis presented. This sign would be used where there is a bike lane between other lanes, or a bike lane only is to be used for a single movement, using Section 2B 19 as model. The discussion was tabled, to be resumed Thursday.

Contraflow Bike Lanes on One-way Streets

This was a placeholder in the FHWA Part 9 draft. The ITE TCD handbook and NACTO address contraflow lanes. Do we need this in the MUTCD?

Rock Miller had prepared a proposal. There are several different types of contraflow bike lanes, some with greatly different operating issues at driveways and intersections. There were strong opinions both ways as to whether to allow “wrong way” parking beyond a contraflow lane.

DeBruyn: Use one-way except bikes sign at one end, only one way at the other. Turn prohibition?

Jackson: no one-way arrow on the approach.

Chang – engineer needs flexibility. Specific language wouldn't allow experimentation.

Ciccarelli: The contraflow lane belongs on the left side. New wording could be where we define bicycle lanes, and keep practitioners from placing the contraflow bike lane on the wrong side.

Williams: we need this because an engineer refused to do anything not in the MUTCD.

Ciccarelli: modify figure in 9C-6 and section 9C.04. This would show where the lane goes, and allow depiction of signs. Expand existing section on bike lanes.

Petritsch – modify the white stripe specifications.

Schubert – problem in saying wrong-way riding is OK here.

No final version was achieved. The joint working group will discuss this tonight and the BTC will take it up again tomorrow.

Buffered bike lanes

A proposal had been developed by Bill DeSantis. The concept had been tested under NCHRP 15-42. There was a discussion of marking types: both hatching and chevrons require manual placement. A conclusion: if the buffer is 3 feet or wider, so it might be mistaken for a bike lane, transverse markings should be used. Ciccarelli: we also need to modify Section 1A.13 of the MUTCD (definitions). The proposal was tabled for further work the next day.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5 PM to make way for the Pedestrian Task Force.

NCUTCD Bicycle Technical Committee Minutes

Thursday, January 9, 2014, Arlington, Virginia

Prepared by John S. Allen, reviewed by members of the Bicycle Technical Committee

Attendance

BTC members (See <http://www.ncutcdbtc.org/members.html> for affiliations.)

Richard Moeur, Chair	Michael Jackson
John Allen, Secretary	Dwight Kingsbury
John Ciccarelli	Peter Koonce
Mike Coleman	Dan Lang
Ted Curtis	Theo Petritsch
Mike Cynecki	Rock Miller
Josh deBruyn	John Schubert
Bill DeSantis	Bill Schultheiss
Cindy Engelhart	Craig Williams
Bill Fox	Mighk Wilson

Guests

* Prospective member

Dongho Chan, City of Seattle*	Phil Miller, APBP
Kevin Dunn, FHWA	Peter Speer, Pexco/Davidson
Randy McCourt	Ginny Sullivan, Adventure Cycling*

Call to Order

Richard Moeur was presenting to another technical committee. Randy McCourt called the meeting to order at 1:08 PM

Sites Open to Public Travel

McCourt led a discussion of Sites Open to Public Travel (SOPT).

MUTCD now applies to all public and private sites, with adjustment to sizes of signs for slower travel etc.

A SOPT task force went through the material. BTC went through material on selective exclusion signs. Each TC now will have SOPT material to go to the Edit Committee. There was a discussion of whether this addressed the broader issue of right of access; also, why only bicyclists and pedestrians are included in the proposal, as there are selective exclusions and wayfinding also for equestrians, skateboarders, inline skaters etc.

Allen: The issue of access is not the same as with a limited-access highway. It is of access not to a route, but to an area, possibly via an alternate route. Also, there is the issue of prohibiting equipment versus prohibiting its use (e.g., is it OK to carry a skateboard but not to ride one).

Cicarelli: States don't prohibit access on public streets other than limited-access highways. At private locations, bicyclists can generally be prohibited at will. Private developers assume that they can just prohibit bicyclists.

McCourt: Fear is that Council will drop the proposal if it asserts right of access.

Petritsch: It's a design issue. If you have decided on an alternate route, then you have to direct people to it but to say you have to provide an alternate route is beyond the purview of the MUTCD.

A motion was made and approved to adopt SOPT guidance: If exclusions are utilized to prohibit access to or from a SOPT and a convenient alternate option is provided, then adequate directional signage to the access point should be provided. While selective modal exclusions are discouraged, if utilized in a SOPT, then directional signage to alternative access points should be provided. [Need link to proposal.]

Reports from other Committees and Working Groups

Park and Ride Sign

GMITC rejected the BTC proposal and asked instead for a bicycle parking plaque which could be placed under a D4-2 Park-Ride sign.

Bicycle Signals

A joint committee went through all of the proposals Wednesday evening. Interim approvals can't easily get modified. We'll send out the proposal after the meeting for final vote and approval by e-mail. Then it goes to sponsors.

Miller: not many ways to use the Interim Approval as written.

Koonce: right turn on red was most restrictive based on use. Many existing bicycle signal installations would have to come out to satisfy IA-16.

Work on Proposals

Contraflow bicycle lanes

This discussion carried over from the previous day. BTC discussed the proposal, narrowing it so it only covers specific options, and approved it. [Markings TC concurred and this goes to NCUTCD sponsors. Proposal as approved by BTC and MTC may be seen at <http://www.ncutdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/contraflowbikelane.doc>.]

Buffered bike lanes

There was a discussion of the definition of a bicycle lane buffer and other issues. The proposal was updated and approved. [Markings TC concurred, and the proposal goes out to Sponsors. Proposal as approved by BTC and MTC may be seen at <http://www.ncutdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/bufferbikelane.doc>.]

Bicycle Lane Intersection Control Sign

There was a discussion of a proposal which had been developed in yesterday's meeting and revised by Bill DeSantis. Two proposals were approved by BTC: an R3-5hP bicycle symbol plaque with R3-5 and R3-8 signs, and allowing the bicycle symbol/word in lieu of ONLY on R3-8 signs. These will go into

Chapter 2B with a reference in Part 9. [RWSTC concurred with both proposals; they go to NCUTCD sponsors. Proposals as approved by BTC and RWSTC may be seen at: <http://www.ncutcdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/r3-5hpbikeplaque.doc> and <http://www.ncutcdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/r3-8bikelegend.doc>.]

Two-stage Turn Queuing Box

This was a placeholder in the draft of the new version of Part 9. Allen had drafted a proposal and led a discussion (in the absence of Moeur); the proposal was modified. The BTC approved the modified proposal, though there is a need to collect more information on additional appropriate designs. Markings TC did not have time to consider the proposal at this meeting. [No link to proposal, as it isn't going to sponsors this cycle.]

Raised Devices in Bikeways

DeSantis presented. After discussion, tubular delineators were accepted, and raised reflectorized markers rejected.

Ciccarelli: to make delineators usable, the bike lane must be wider.

It was decided that the topic needs further refinement. The window for submission to the markings TC has passed, so there is no urgency in having a proposal to present. The discussion was tabled. There also will be a discussion later this evening at the Raised Devices Working Group meeting. [No link, as this proposal isn't ready for release yet.]

Markings has concurred with the buffered bike lane, though, and the raised devices might be a modification of this proposal.

Looking Ahead

There are several items we need to discuss before the June meeting, or August deadline. The time for MUTCD proposals through the standard NCUTCD process has passed. BTC can proceed and present proposals directly to the FHWA, but those proposals will not have full NCUTCD approval. FHWA has listened to us on such things in the past.

The June meeting will be Wednesday June 25-Saturday June 28 at the Ramada Hotel near the Mall of America in Minneapolis, also near the airport and light rail. Times for TC meetings and General Session are still under discussion.

The January 2015 meeting will be Tuesday through Friday, January 6-9, 2015, at the Hilton Crystal City in Arlington, Virginia.

The week is to be determined for the June 2015 4-day meeting in the greater San Antonio area.

Moeur will send TC members all the proposals which have been sent out to other TCs. On the two-stage turn queuing box and Except Bicycles sign, he may ask for electronic voting from other TCs but doesn't expect approval.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 PM.