

NCUTCD BTC meeting, Wednesday, January 7, 2015

Attendance

BTC members:

Richard Moeur, Chair	Peter Koonce
John Allen, Secretary	Rock Miller
Dongho Chang	Theo Petritsch
Mike Coleman	Nathan Richman
Ted Curtis	John Schubert
Mike Cynecki	Bill Schultheiss
Josh DeBruyn	Lee Stuart
Bill DeSantis	Ron van Houten
Cindy Engelhart	Craig Williams (arrived late, airline delay)
Michael Jackson	Mighk Wilson
Dwight Kingsbury	

Guests:

Fernando Castillo, REI	Kirk Roberts, City of Bloomington, Minnesota
Kevin Dunn FHWA	Stuart Robertson, Kimley-Horn
Gene Hawkins, Edit Committee	Ryan Snyder, Ryan Snyder Associates.
Jim Kalchbrenner, Pexco	Joe Stafford, Pennsylvania Bicycle Access Council

Call to Order

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

General Business, Membership

Moeur still needs to review the minutes of the June 2015 meeting, so approval of the minutes is postponed.

The items in the current review cycle have already been sent to FHWA for possible inclusion in the MUTCD. Since the items have already been approved by Council and sent to FHWA, the goal in reviewing items is not to revise the proposals but to provide a response to the docket: "we thought about that, but." We don't know yet what is going to be in the draft MUTCD. Unless we have something in a FHWA-published draft, we don't have anything to comment on.

Membership: Dan Lang has resigned. It doesn't look as though Mike Colety will be at this meeting, so he becomes an "emeritus member" due to missing three consecutive meetings. There are three prospective members: Kirk Roberts, with the City of Bloomington, Minnesota, Ryan Snyder with Ryan Snyder and Associates in Los Angeles, and Ginny Sullivan from the Adventure Cycling Association, who can't make this meeting. Richard has recommended that Kirk Roberts and Ryan Snyder be approved as BTC members at the executive committee meeting this evening. Ginny will be considered for membership at a future meeting where she's in attendance. Dewayne Carver from Florida DOT has

expressed interest in BTC membership, but couldn't attend this meeting.

After all these changes, the BTC will have 25 members: 14 government, 11 non-government. This will allow for the possible addition of more non-government members.

Agenda

Much of the meeting will be focused on addressing comments from sponsors on items already sent directly to FHWA for rulemaking.

There also might be time to address sponsor responses and modify content of Uniform Vehicle Code changes (UVC) affecting bicyclists.

2017 MUTCD rulemaking update:

Kevin Dunn: It is possible that there will be a published Notice of Proposed Amendments (NPA) proposing a new edition of the MUTCD by May 2015. It is currently in the Legal Department, and once that work is finished, the NPA goes to the White House for determination whether this is a significant or insignificant rule. That can take months. Do we need a 4-day meeting in June?

Moeur: We have one meeting to review our entire part of the MUTCD: do a thorough line-by-line review and provide detailed comments. Get some rest beforehand! If the rulemaking gets delayed, we have another meeting like this. After the rulemaking, we get started on new proposals.

Comments from sponsors on items sent directly to sponsors for rulemaking

Whatever we come up with here can be submitted to the NPA docket as a comment from NCUTCD. Since the Council will vote on all comments, our responses/comments have to be palatable to Council.

Miller: we don't know whether these are what will be in the MUTCD. We want a general sense whether the comment is on base and if so, how do we want to use it. We need to be able to give the reason why without going into a lot of detail.

Sponsor comments had been distributed to NCUTCD members in an e-mail of December 24, in the Microsoft Excel workbook SponsorcommentsDec142014.xls

Two-Stage Turn Queuing Box (TSTQB)

The first proposal to be discussed (and the only one discussed on this day) was the two-stage turn queuing box (TSTQB), online at <http://ncutcdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/2stageturnbox.doc> . I

Moeur: It was mentioned at the Chairs meeting that definitions shall be approved by the Edit Committee. This one wasn't. DeSantis and Kingsbury are on the committee. This adds time and complication to the process. The Edit Committee meeting already occurred this morning before our meeting, but they will try to use an electronic ballot between meetings to vote on any proposed definitions.

For the sake of expediency, if we don't agree with a comment, we don't take action on it.

- DeSantis had identified categories of comments in a draft spreadsheet of sponsor comments.

This document with DeSantis's initial notes on BTC's comments is SponsorcommentsDec142014 101 response.xls , which DeSantis distributed to the BTC in his e-mail of February 4, 2015.

The document Comments-Bike-Fall20142.xls contains the comments as expanded from the notes, and distributed to the BTC and the chairs of the other technical committees.

There was a long discussion of specifics of issues raised:

- Does a TSTQB cause deviation from standard traffic rules at intersections?
- Not much North American research on this treatment.
- Will TSTQBs only be used at signalized intersections?
- Is the turn movement regulated under the law only by the signal in the original direction of travel, so it becomes a left turn from the right side of the road?
- What is cross-street stop control? T intersection? Uncontrolled? Green indication?
- Will TSTQBs encourage red-light running?
- What if a bicyclist doesn't reach the box before light changes? Cross traffic must yield, same as crossing any intersection.
- Striping: is the initial transverse white line in the box a stop line? Do we need the striping on all sides? Is green color required?
- The TSTQB is in the intersection per UVC and some states' definitions, but a vehicle is typically expected to clear the intersection. This is a legal issue, though state laws already allow a two-stage left turn.
- Will bicyclists queue in the crosswalk at TSTQB locations?
- Many points about the path of right turning traffic. Review wording on the need for No Turn on Red signs with this treatment.
- Mandatory or optional use? Add "if used" to para 01.
- Do people need to know whether the use of a TSTQB is mandatory for turns?
- Would people use it as a bike box?
- Dimensioning? FHWA or other design guides will need to address this.
- Does it belong in the MUTCD?
- Add markings to standard signs and markings book? Let FHWA decide.
- Required for streets with light rail? No.
- Is this device the only place where bicycle symbols are mandated?
- Clarify it is for bicyclists?

Schubert: this is way too complicated.

Schultheiss volunteered to provide text for waiting for a stop or signal-controlled intersection.

Petritsch volunteered to provide a support statement to explain the purpose.

Engelhart: Virginia DOT is supporting a research project but not the device

Hawkins: no definition is needed, so no Edit Committee action is required

Uniform Vehicle Code (UVC)

After the conclusion of the work on the turn box, a few minutes were available for discussion of UVC priorities.

There had been a long discussion within the BTC by e-mail of the definitions for “bicycle”, <http://john-s-allen.com/UVC/01-0109-bicycle-001.doc> and “electric bicycle”, <http://john-s-allen.com/UVC/01-new-electricbicycle-001.doc>, but this had not reached a conclusion, and the BTC determined that continuing the discussion in the meeting would take too much time. Instead, the BTC determined to address:

11-301 (driving on right), <http://john-s-allen.com/UVC/11-0301-driveright-001.doc> + 11-1205 (bicycle position on road), <http://john-s-allen.com/UVC/11-1205-bikeposition-001.doc> (together)
11-606 (bicycle hand signals) <http://john-s-allen.com/UVC/11-0606-handsignal-001.doc>
11-1206 (riding two abreast), <http://john-s-allen.com/UVC/11-1206-twoabreast-001.doc>
11-307 (no passing zones), <http://john-s-allen.com/UVC/11-0307-NPZ-001.doc>

Sponsor responses to all of these proposals are online at <http://john-s-allen.com/UVC>.

This discussion was postponed to Thursday, as the MUTCD work was on deadline and as there would be a Rules of the Road Task Force meeting Wednesday evening which might affect the proposals we were to review.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5 PM to make way for the Pedestrian Task Force, and will reconvene at 1 PM on Thursday.

NCUTCD BTC meeting, Thursday, January 8, 2015

Attendance

BTC members:

Richard Moeur, Chair
John Allen, Secretary
Dongho Chang
Mike Coleman
Ted Curtis
Mike Cynecki
Josh DeBruyn
Bill DeSantis
Cindy Engelhart
Michael Jackson
Dwight Kingsbury

Peter Koonce
Rock Miller
Theo Petritsch
Nathan Richman
Kirk Roberts
John Schubert
Ryan Snyder
Bill Schultheiss
Ron van Houten
Craig Williams
Mighk Wilson

Guests:

Tom Aber, Impact Recovery
Fernando Castillo, REI
Randy Dittberner, Virginia DOT
Kevin Dunn FHWA
Gene Hawkins, NCUTCD Vice-Chair
Jim Kalchbrenner, Pexco

Ravi Raut, City of Alexandria, Virginia
Stuart Robertson, Kimley-Horn
Joe Stafford, Pennsylvania Bicycle Access Council
Mark Wilson, Florida DOT
Dave Woodin, NYSDOT, Markings Committee

Call to Order

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

General Business, Membership

Moeur had been very busy with meetings and preparation of material, and will check over the June 2014 minutes in the next couple of days, sending them out for approval by e-mail.

Ryan Snyder and Kirk Roberts were approved at the Board of Directors meeting and are now members of the BTC.

David Kuemmel was recognized for his 40 years of service with the NCUTCD; he is retiring.

Dave Woodin, of Markings TC: the BTC will take on review of the two-stage turn queuing box and bike lane extensions.

Report on Pedestrian Task Force

Van Houten reported on the Pedestrian Task Force: a research study has shown an increase in yielding to pedestrians in Gainesville with culture change. There is to be a 4-year follow up to determine whether yielding rates continue. David Massey had reported on pedestrian hybrid beacons: you can't just do a one-off installation without outreach and expect people to know what to do; same with RRFBs. Work in China with a flashing countdown shows more compliance.

Someone from Portland, Oregon had reported on a sign to warn about turning buses colliding with pedestrians. These crashes are rare but deadly. There was not much behavior data, mostly focus groups. A quick survey with a lot of info in the questions gets better results: "does this work," "has this helped you?" as opposed to "what do you want?"

There seems to be a social norming effect with driver behavior with respect to pedestrians. In some parts of the country, everyone yields, in others, none and if you move, your behavior changes because that's how it works there.

Stafford: Could culture-change approach be used for bicycling outreach?

Engelhart: There was a description of a pedestrian signal with a figure of someone dancing crossing the street. Petritsch: that can lead to cognitive capture, and that's bad.

Uniform Vehicle Code

Allen reported on the UVC Task Force meeting the previous evening: the entire meeting was about wording of the introduction which would appear in the NCUTCD's revision. There had been no discussion at the Task Force meeting of proposed changes to the model law.

Comments from sponsors are online along with the proposals in their form preceding the meeting, at <http://john-s-allen.com/UVC/>

The BTC first began work on 11-301 and 11-1205, but abandoned it after realizing that there was not time for the discussion. Current (pre-meeting) versions are at <http://john-s-allen.com/UVC/11-0301-driveright-001.doc> and <http://john-s-allen.com/UVC/11-1205-bikeposition-001.doc> .

The BTC then addressed overtaking on the left – consolidating material as Schubert suggested. The discussion resulted in revision of the proposal for section 11-303 of the UVC from the version in the document online at <http://john-s-allen.com/UVC/11-0303-overtakingleft-001.doc> into the version in 11-0303-overtakingleft-002.doc, which Moeur distributed to the BTC in an e-mail of February 5, 2015. The new version incorporated the provision for overtaking slow vehicles which had previously been in a proposed revision of 11-307 online at <http://john-s-allen.com/UVC/11-0307-NPZ-001.doc> . The proposed modification to 11-307 was accordingly retracted.

Comments from sponsors on items sent directly to sponsors for rulemaking

The BTC continued its discussion of sponsor comments on proposals from BTC that went directly to the Federal Highway Administration. Comments were very numerous.

Discussion started with

- Bicycle 102, the proposed turning vehicles yield to bicycle sign, R10-15a and b. The proposal is online at <http://ncutdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/r10-15bike.doc> .

There were 40 comments. There has been testing of the pedestrian sign but not the bicycle sign. Discussion in June was “do we come up with a sign based on good human factors, or just go with modifying the existing pedestrian sign?”

Discussion continued with

- Bicycle 103, bike lane extensions through intersections, which is online at <http://ncutdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/blextension.doc> and
- Bicycle 104, bicycle wayfinding signs, which is online at <http://ncutdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/pathwayfinding.doc>

The BTC’s comments on sponsors’ responses to these proposals may be found in the document Comments-Bike-Fall20142.xls which Moeur distributed to the BTC in an e-mail on February 4, 2015. Note that since all these items were already approved directly by Council in June 2014, no action was taken at this time.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 PM. Next meeting is to be June 17-19, 2015 in San Antonio, Texas.