

**Bicycle Technical Committee – June 28 - 30, 2006 Meeting Minutes
Overland Park, Kansas**

Wednesday, June 28th

Present: Richard Moeur, John LaPlante, James Mackay, Michael Jackson, Tim Oliver, and Bill Fox

Guests: Cindy Engelhart, Don Pflaum, Roland Stanger (FHWA)

RM Currently the BTC has 19 members – we need 50% plus one for quorum

RM Chairs Meeting Report – FHWA still looking for funding to produce the 2008 edition of the Manual. Anything acted on by National at the Jan. 07 meeting might still be included in the next edition of the Manual. Rulemaking typically takes 9+ months.

RM One pending item is the Bikes May Use Full Lane sign (that was voted down by National in June '05). We need to find out how many states have wording in their vehicle code that is conducive to using this sign. Also, Human Factors Task Force was created that will serve as a resource for the technical committees. Has volunteered Ron Van Houten as our participant on this task force.

Existing Part Nine Minor Change Proposals:

JM Use of “devises” instead of “devices” in the final support statement in Part 9C.04. RM will send an email requesting that this be corrected to Edit committee (and copy FHWA).

MJ Figures 9B-4 and 9 B-5 – is proposing that the one line destination signs be added.

RM We will send a request the D1-2, D1-2A, D1-3, and D1-3A signs be added to Figure 9B-4 to Edit Committee (and copy FHWA).

MJ Figure 9B-5 seems to be an inefficient way to convey guide sign information. Suggest the removal of the M7-1 signs and correct the D1-1 sign to include the arrow.

JL Marking TC is taking up rumble strips and rumble stripes topics. We should know what they are doing.

RM (Subsequent development) The change to "devises" in 9C.04, adding D1-2 thru D1-3a to Figure 9B-4, and the minor signing changes to Figure 9B-5 were all been ruled editorial in nature by Edit Committee and Lee Billingsley on Friday the 30th. Lee and Bob have asked the BTC to draft a letter including these changes that will be sent directly to FHWA (no need to go through the full NC process).

“Inconsistencies with definition of “Traveled Way”

RM Had taken inconsistencies with traveled way topic to Markings TC as a result of Jan. 06 meeting.

At the January meeting we had achieved the following consensus – *“Delete the term “bicycle lanes” from the current Edge Line Markings exclusion statement in Part 3B.07. Moeur to take to Markings Technical Committee for their action.”*

RM No action was taken since that then. Markings TC will take this forward as their proposal to sponsors this fall.

Thursday June 29, 2006

Present: Richard Moeur, John LaPlante, Cindy Engelhart, Bill Fox, Michelle DeRobertis, Tim Oliver, Michael Jackson, James Mackay

Guests: Don Pflaum, Roland Stanger

Shared Lane Marking

RM Would like good data by January to send to Council about the Shared Lane Marking.

JL The San Francisco study focused on locations with on street parking. We need data for where the SLM marking is used without parking

MDR Need data on where bicyclists may use shoulders on a state by state basis.

RM Action Items - Research and determine how many states:

- 1) Require motorists to merge into the bike lane before a right turn;
- 2) Require bicyclists to ride as “far right as practicable”;
- 3) Allow exceptions to requirements that bicyclists ride as “far right as practicable”, and;
- 4) Define circumstances where bicyclists may or must use shoulders.

Temporary Traffic Control

BF Need additional definition of bicycle detours in Part 6.

RM Need to put together a package to take to TTC. Bill Fox to lead a task force.

JM and RM will both transmit existing documents on this to Bill.

Bicycle Repair Services sign

MJ Would like to see a white on blue Bike Repair sign added to the MUTCD.

RM Any combination of symbols needs to go through Human Factors testing. Default size would be 24” x 24” – will check to be sure.

After a discussion we agreed to the following Action Items:

- 1) MJ will – and others may - come up with ideas for this sign;
- 2) Have human factors testing done by Ron Van Houten;
- 3) Review the test data so we can craft proposals around signs that test well, and;
- 4) Take the resultant package to Guide and Motorist Information TC.

Sign Mounting Height

MDR Part 9 standards seem excessively stringent.

After a discussion we agreed to the following Action Items:

- 1) Take the vertical and lateral maximum sign mounting dimensions out of part Nine – both in the standards text and corresponding figures;
- 2) Retain the minimums as standards adding the 8 foot overhead sign clearance to Figure 9B-1 as well;
- 3) Create an Option or Support statement that if these minimum offsets cannot be upheld then the sign shall be mounted 7' above the shared use trail;
- 4) Ballot these changes within our committee;
- 5) Send the balloted changes to sponsors, and;
- 6) Take the proposed changes to National in January '07.

RM We also have time to send this to sponsors in the fall 2006 cycle, as long as a figure and wording can be developed and balloted electronically by BTC in the next several weeks.

Research Committee

JL Topics discussed included:

- 1) He provided a report on the three BTC study topics currently underway:
 - A) Wayfinding signs;
 - B) Colored pavement markings, and;
 - C) Shared Roadway Marking initiatives.
- 2) The Research Committee discussed the need for better guidance and formatting assistance for people who want to do experimentation. Some experimentation topics could be conducted via pooled fund or NCHRP studies.
- 3) A dialogue took place about complaints that having the Vice Chair of every technical committee attend the research committee meeting creates issues when they have to skip their own committee meeting in order to attend. There is a potential to have the research committee meeting take place at another time.

Additional Shared Use Pathway Topics

MJ Sundry concerns:

- 1) Transportation funding is used to build facilities which are designed by Parks agencies that think of them as recreational facilities. Time of day restrictions are oftentimes imposed on these facilities.
- 2) Destination signs at intersections of shared use paths when placed above the D11-1 sign. Section 9B-21 states that destination signs may be placed below the bike route signs.
- 3) Regulatory signs directing bicyclists to use pedestrian signals.

Traffic Signal Topics

RM Part 9D does not address detection or clearance intervals for bicyclists at traffic signals.

There was committee interest in having the existing R9-5 sign Bikes Use Ped Signal removed from Part 9. Part 4E of the Manual about Pedestrian Signals currently has a support statement that these signals are intended for the exclusive use of pedestrians. We then agreed to initiate a bicycle traffic signal head dialogue, possibly leading to a proposal based on data, to Signals TC in January. We might have data from Portland or Denver experiments by then.

Friday, June 23rd – National Committee

RM The change to "devises" in 9C.04, adding D1-2 thru D1-3a to Figure 9B-4, and the minor signing changes to Figure 9B-5 were all been ruled editorial in nature by Edit Committee and Lee Billingsley on Friday the 30th. Lee and Bob have asked the BTC to draft a letter including these changes that will be sent directly to FHWA (no need to go through the full NC process).

Future Meeting Locations

2007 Winter - January 17 – 19 in Arlington, VA
2007 Summer - June 23 – 25 in Lake Tahoe, CA
2008 Winter – January 9 -11 in Arlington, VA
2008 Summer - Alabama
2009 Winter – Arlington, VA
2009 Summer - Northeast US (AASHTO Region 1 {NASTO})

Respectfully submitted,

James Mackay