

NCUTCD BTC meeting, Wednesday January 6, 2016

Minutes prepared by John Allen

Attendance

BTC members:

Richard Moeur, Chair
John Allen, Secretary
Dongho Chang
Ted Curtis
Mike Cynecki
Josh DeBruyn
Bill DeSantis
Cindy Engelhart
Bill Fox, arrived 4 PM
Michael Jackson
Dwight Kingsbury

Peter Koonce
Rock Miller
Theo Petritsch
Kirk Roberts
John Schubert, arrived 2:30
Bill Schultheiss
Ryan Snyder
Lee Stuart
Ron van Houten
Craig Williams, arrived 2:00
Mighk Wilson, arrived 2:30

Guests:

Jesse Boudart, Kittelson Associates
Dewayne Carver, Florida DOT
Peter Doan, FHWA
Kevin Hall, Evonik Industries
Gene Hawkins, NCUTCD Vice-Chair (attended briefly)
Mike Kimlinger, Oregon DOT

David Kirschner, FHWA/MUTCD
Adam Moore, City of Portland, Oregon
James Robertson, City of College Station, Texas (arrived 4:50)
Stewart Robertson, Kimley-Horn

BTC business

Richard Moeur called the meeting to order shortly after 1 PM

Members and guests introduced themselves.

One member has left, Nathan Richman, a government member (Waseca County, MN). There are now 23 members: 13 government, 12 non-government. There are two prospective members, Stewart Robertson (non-government) and Dewayne Carver (government). We are looking for prospective members.

Comment resolution on fall 2015 proposals

The plan was to send out comments much earlier. Moeur took a stab at responses. We do a quick review today, have a working group tonight and discuss tomorrow

Sponsor responses to comments

15B-BIK 01, numbered bike routes

- One item of discussion was about cross-referencing. Others were about details of the proposal
- There was a discussion of signage as a requirement for numbered bike routes. The original 1978 US Bike Route 1 was an AASHTO project and there was no signing requirement.

(See proposal approved by the General Council at <http://ncutdbtc.org/sponsors/fall15/15b-bik-01-final.pdf>.)

15BBIK-02, general service signs

- We did not agree with any of the comments.
- Standard size would be 12 inches.

(See proposal approved by the General Council at <http://ncutdbtc.org/sponsors/fall15/15b-bik-02-final.pdf>.)

Volunteers for the working group were Petritsch, Desantis, Carver and Moeur.

FHWA RTE status, Missouri research

Ted Curtis discussed FHWA RTE status. There are 3 experiments, none complete.

(Curtis's PDF for this presentation, ExpUpdateColumbiaMO.pdf, was distributed to the BTC in an e-mail of January, 7, 2016 sent by Richard Moeur.)

Alternate Pavement Marking for Bicycle Route Wayfinding RTE 9(09)-67E: This is an alternative to SLM "directional" chevrons, M1 signs; may be needed at complex intersections. Portland, Oregon had circular ones; Columbia tried them but they were too small; Alta did research on this topic. U of Missouri used a bicycle simulator and simulation tests. Round 24" on-street and 12" off-street symbols were tested vs. signs. (Details in the PDF.)

Curtis's presentation was interrupted for the mid-afternoon break. Markings TC is meeting in the Richmond Room. We reconvene there after the break.

Markings Committee Presentation

Randy Dittberner gave a presentation on zigzag markers^[1] to indicate that motorists need to use caution and slow when approaching a place where a shared-use path crosses a road. Issues:

- Zigzag on edge vs. zigzag in center of lane?
- Shorten the zigzags closer to the crossing to suggest slowing?
- Would drivers know what it means? Comment: this is an endemic problem with new markings.
- Questionnaire: did drivers agree that it increased attention?
- Signalized crossings result in a long delay and compliance problem Jurisdictions may decline to install a HAWK (pedestrian hybrid beacon).
- Van Houten: is there a concern with motorcycles skidding due to paint in the travel lane?

FHWA RTE Status, continued

Bicycle Pavement Markings Detector Symbol, RTE 9(09)-66E

The bicycle must be positioned in the correct location to trigger a signal actuator. Portland had conducted a study with blue indicator lights, 5 symbols. Columbia did field testing at two locations. There are not many symbols which have to be explained by a sign. Many cyclists don't understand it. The experiment was concurrent with the one for wayfinding symbols. Experimental symbols and a standard one with a green background were tried. One with a bicycle in a green box was preferred as most intuitive.

Use of Alternate Pavement Markings for Bicycle Boulevards, RTE 9(09)-44E

Goal is to identify a bicycle boulevard, indicate where to ride, discourage motor vehicle traffic, provide wayfinding, attract cyclists. Alta was contracted to do research.

Comments:

- Speed limits are not as useful as what the streets look like.
- Engelhart likes the yellow line because it comes to look like a shared-use path.
- Petritsch likes stage testing, put in centerline later, see whether cars speed up.

Adjournment

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

NCUTCD BTC meeting, Thursday, January 7, 2016

Minutes prepared by John Allen

Attendance

BTC members:

Richard Moeur, Chair
John Allen, Secretary
DeWayne Carver
Dongho Chang
Ted Curtis
Mike Cynecki
Josh DeBruyn
Michelle DeRobertis
Bill DeSantis
Cindy Engelhart
Bill Fox
Michael Jackson
Dwight Kingsbury

Peter Koonce
Rock Miller
Theo Petritsch
Kirk Roberts
Stewart Robertson
John Schubert
Bill Schultheiss
Ryan Snyder
Lee Stuart
Ron van Houten
Craig Williams
Mighk Wilson

Guests:

Kevin Hall, Evonik Industries
Jesse Boudart, Kittelson Associates
Bob Garrett, NCUTCD

Adam Moore, City of Portland, Oregon
Kevin Sylvester, FHWA
David Kirschner, FHWA

BTC Business

DeWayne Carver and Stewart Robertson are now BTC members.

Pedestrian Task Force Report

There had been a discussion of pedestrians' not knowing how much time was available to cross and of intersections without pedestrian signals. There was also a discussion of research and of the cost of retrofitting. And there is no central repository for research papers.

Elevating the task force to a committee: where would it fit into the manual? There needs to be support from the NCUTCD Board and delegates from sponsor organizations. Step 1 is to make the case. Eagan Foster needs to take the lead; discuss this spring.

Part 9 was added in 1978 but had no associated technical committee until the creation of the BTC in 1996. (There was a bicycle task force prior to the creation of the BTC, similar to the Pedestrian Task Force)

Bylaws and such determine who may be on a committee: expert, practitioner or researcher. The chair has complete authority. Member of a delegation is assigned by a sponsoring organization, AASHTO, ITE, etc. Some organizations have applied for NCUTCD membership but not been approved.

Engelhart: Thinks that there is a critical mass. Probably enough now to make a go of it.

Minimum is a chair, vice chair, secretary and at least 5 total Council members (voting or associate).

Council meeting

Moeur: Council meeting approved docket comment about structure of the MUTCD, now at regulations.gov, Docket FHWA -2015-0002, <https://www.regulations.gov/#!documentDetail;D=FHWA-2015-0002-0001> . This would be a way to put in a request for a pedestrian Part of the MUTCD. There are three Parts on devices and the rest on mode or location/specific applications. Previous comments turned down splitting the MUTCD into two documents.

Draft provided by working groups on changes to proposals was reviewed. Bike-001 and Bike-002 (see Wednesday minutes) were approved also, table headings for minimum sizes.

Signals TC

Yesterday: not all of signals TC were there. They were discussing detectors. Presence of BTC members helped to clarify bicycle issues.

BTC ad-hoc working groups

Non-numbered bicycle route signs: changes per sponsor comments were OK and consistent. BTC approved the changes.

Bicycle service guide sign: Only change was the addition of a table.

UVC

Moeur: Work on the UVC is not speedy or productive. We need to create a working group. NCUTLO financial model went defunct due to the Internet. Are we the right people to be writing the law?

Engelhart: Consultants and the traffic engineers/coordinators have different needs.

States can point to the UVC: it gives some credibility.

Jackson: has law degree and would be willing to help out.

DeSantis: Police officers expressed frustration with new types of facilities that are not covered in the law and are not enforced.

Miller: League has its own working group which can probably point to one state or another as a model. Consensus can be a problem.

Moeur: MUTCD content comes first, then UVC.

Allen volunteered as chair; Carver, Chang, Curtis, DeSantis, Petritsch, Snyder, Stuart, Wilson; Miller as liaison to the League; Jackson asked to be filled in and to liaison with tort liability

Priority list

See <http://ncutcdbtc.org/future/btcpriority.pdf> -- as of this writing, the list reflects the decisions made at the January meeting.

FHWA – the list given to Bruce Friedman of possible IA devices has not been seen by Kevin Sylvester. The list of devices that BTC saw in December/January of 2013 may or may not be a part of the Notice of Proposed Amendments.

Items discussed were:

Active

Bicycles on Road plaque. Definition of “Road” says see “roadway.” Definition of Roadway is “exclusive of the berm or shoulder.” BTC favors adding a plaque with ON ROAD (rather than IN LANE or ON ROADWAY message) in chapter 2B (for use with signs warning of various roadway user types), which would replace current STR plaque. **DeBruyn is to share Michigan DOT’s supplemental guidance.** Engelhart: concern that a Bicycle In Roadway is black and yellow and that bicycles are not “hazards”. **Schultheiss to modify his draft proposal for our review this spring.**

Bicycle parking plaque: DeBruyn wanted a pictogram. Do we need this, as we have the D4-2 sign? Moeur: GMI was amenable to a bicycle parking plaque under a park and ride sign.

Petritsch volunteered to develop a proposal Spring 2016, DeBruyn to work with him.

Definitions in Part 1 of the MUTCD: there are inconsistencies with the UVC, etc. **Schultheiss is to draft a proposal Spring 2016.**

Bicycle Merge signs and Markings: needs resubmission to RWSTC, removing the “left” and “Right” direction so the sign just reads “Bikes (Symbol) Merge”. DeSantis: we got a response back from RW committee who saw it as a lane drop rather than a merge. Proposal will be presented to RWSTC in June.

Bicycle service signing: we have drafts, and are waiting for data. Can work on this in spring 2016. Possibly get into pooled fund study. **WMU (van Houten) may do preliminary human factors testing. DeBruyn: Michigan DOT will move forward with research and will have a consultant to assign.**

Pending

Bicyclist overtaking (3-foot passing) signs: this topic has been accepted into the cycle of pooled-funding research. Should we move forward before the study results are in? CA, FL and UT signs posed the fewest problems. Any proposal must recognize the variability of passing distances among states.

Signs and markings for rail and light rail crossings: Pending evaluation of pooled-fund study.

Raised devices in bikeways: **Schultheiss to create list of action items.**

Sidepath intersection conflicts: waiting on Michigan DOT research. **Miller drafting RPS for the Research Committee.**

Tech guidance on SLMs: do we do anything in it? It is in the ITE Traffic Control Devices Handbook. Search for money – Miller drafting research proposal. **DeSantis will evaluate whether more MUTCD content is needed.**

Bicycle wayfinding markings: awaiting results of research, Columbia, MO and other.

Through bicycle travel in right-turn lanes: Awaiting NPA comment. SLMs approved, lane within lane not approved.

Bike/bus/right-turn lanes: Need to collect research and develop proposal. Awaiting NPA comment. **DeRobertis assigned.**

Markings for bicycle boulevards and bicycle routes: can use standard markings. Develop content in future?

Colored bicycle lanes: Interim approval issued; Markings TC is taking the lead on this. Awaiting

NPA content. Color parameters have not yet been refined.

On Indefinite Hold:

Revised bicycle symbol: requested by outside group. If this ever moves forward, need to discuss with Markings, RWSTC.

BL marking at intersection approaches; solid, dashed or dropped? NCHRP project #15-63 might address this.

Orange markings in work zones: no current champion. Engelhart thought very beneficial.

Sylvester, FHWA: There's an experiment in Wisconsin: There are issues: orange turns yellow under sodium lighting, etc.

Bicycles Use Caution Plaque – what do we do? Does this improve behavior? Not needed.

Jughandles: BTC consensus was that there aren't enough to warrant inclusion in the MUTCD.

Schultheiss says they are needed for two-stage turn queuing boxes (2STQBs).

Bike lanes at back-in angle parking -- awaiting NPA content

Bicycle parking at Park and Ride – **Petritsch**.

Comments on Proposals and Process

Bill Fox suggested with NPA delay, could we get interim approvals (IAs) on proposals which the BTC approved? FHWA: may be possible. It's a high bar to get over.

Schultheiss: 5-7 items are in Separated Bike Lane Guide, AASHTO guide will include them.

Several States developing their own guides. What is the high bar?

Kevin Sylvester, FHWA: there is no IA to establish policy. Typical applications are not IA.

Schultheiss: The two-stage turn queuing box is a major example.

DeBruyn: Michigan DOT requested an interim approval for green US Bike route sign. If

Michigan DOT asked for lane control sign would FHWA approve? How about for a 2STQB?

Sylvester: anyone could make a request and if supported by experimentation, it could be approved.

Schultheiss: can we see a draft of the NPA?

Sylvester (Friedman?): what you saw 2013-2014 was different, preparation for rulemaking. Now NPA is a draft and showing it out would disrupt the rulemaking process. Interim approval fits in as part of rulemaking process. There is no guarantee that what was an interim approval will make it into the MUTCD.

Van Houten: if a device is not harmful it can be left in place for its service life.

Moeur: we can provide additional guidance.

Bike left turn lane at path-roadway intersections -- Petritsch: why do we need to do this? We are already doing it. Consensus was not to include, not needed.

Left side bike lanes on 1-way streets – done. What should be in the MUTCD?

Large-scale markings for travel lanes?

Koonce: issue with bicycle signals: FHWA revised the proposal on bicycle signals. We need to submit a request to FHWA that the IA needs to be revised to be more like the BTC

recommendations. *Moeur: we could send a letter with the Signals TC*

Adjournment, future meetings

The meeting adjourned around 6 PM.

The summer 2016 meeting will be June 8-10 in Savannah, Georgia.

The January 2017 meeting will be in Arlington, Virginia as usual, but early in the month to avoid conflict with the Presidential inaugural.

The summer 2017 meeting will be in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.