

# **NCUTCD Bicycle Technical Committee Minutes June 20, 2012, Orlando, Florida**

Minutes prepared by John S. Allen, July 30, 2012

## ***Attendance***

### **BTC Members**

Richard Moeur, Chair	Bill DeSantis
John LaPlante, Vice Chair	Dan Lang
John Ciccarelli	Theo Petritsch
John Allen, Secretary	Craig Williams
Mike Colety	Ron van Houten
Ted Curtis	

### **Guests**

Lee Stuart, Assoc. Director, ATSSA  
Mighk Wilson, Metroplan Orlando  
Jennifer Bartlett, Sprinkle Consulting  
Tasha Johnson, NCDOT (left at break)  
Jim Kalchbrenner, Pexco/Davidson Traffic Management  
David McKee, Impact Recovery Systems  
Joanne Conrad, TAPCO  
Bruce Friedman, FHWA (arrived 3:40 PM)  
Gene Hawkins, vice-chair programs, chair edit committee (arrived 4:05, spoke briefly, left)

### ***Call to Order***

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

### ***BTC Administrative Issues***

Minutes of the January meeting were approved by acclamation.

Membership is currently at 20, 11 government, 9 non-government.

Dan Dorrell from Oregon DOT has expressed interest in membership - also Mike Coleman with Kittleson Portland.

Vice chair John LaPlante is resigning. The vice-chair must be a member or alternate of one of the delegations.

We need more ITE alternate members.

Bicycle signals task force meets tonight. Bill Schultheiss couldn't make it. Craig Williams volunteered to represent the BTC.

Allen is a member of the NCUTCD Web presence task force and gave a report on its meeting earlier

today. The meeting covered issues of reorganizing the Web site, providing a home page with an introduction and history, on-line registration and payment, links to earlier versions of the MUTCD, and what information should be public, or available to the entire NCUTCD, or available only to an individual Technical Committee – working documents vs. “actions taken” minutes, etc. The question of remote participation in meetings was raised but it has not been resolved. The BTC was recognized as being the leader in maintaining a Web presence, with its own site.

The AASHTO guide is shipping.

ITE Traffic Control Devices Handbook bicycle facilities chapter written by Moeur and Ciccarelli is complete, but other parts are not finished: the Handbook should be available in the fall. Part 9 of the MUTCD is 35 pages. Our chapter in the ITE Handbook is over 100 pages, 30 on Shared Lane Markings alone.

Our bicycle traffic signals proposal is now in the Signals Technical Committee, which has not yet reached full consensus.

A proposal for typical applications for temporary traffic control for bikeways is under review at the Temporary Traffic Control Technical Committee, and will go out to sponsors as a TTC proposal this fall.

### ***FHWA-2010-0159 - Compliance Dates***

Rulemakings on compliance dates have been reviewed and the 58 dates are now down to 12.

### ***Access Board rulemaking (ATBCB-2011-04)***

Rulemaking on rights of way is still being reviewed.

### ***FHWA-2010-0170 - Standards and Engineering Judgment***

Rulemakings on Standards and engineering judgment have undergone minor changes and are closed out.

### ***Recognition of John LaPlante***

John LaPlante is retiring from the Bicycle Technical Committee after this meeting. The BTC recognized him with applause and the gift of a clock made from bicycle parts.

### ***Proposal for Revision to Part 9 Standards***

We had one sponsor proposal, revision of standards statements in Part 9. FHWA has walked back its rulemaking that standards are not subject to modification of engineering judgment. The BTC addressed specific issues noted below.

#### **9B.01 Sign Placement Alongside Paths**

The BTC suggested changes in paragraph 4 of 9B.01 that sign placement should be a recommended condition rather than mandatory. Responses: Sign heights are a “shall” condition in 2A, why not in 9B? Responders want to move it back to a standard.

Comments:

There are issues with snowbanks, and with cyclists' vaulting into overhead signs due to front-wheel-stopping incidents.

Where we put a railing 1 foot from the edge of the path, does a sign have to be 2 feet away?

A too-close sign at the side of the path could be mounted at a minimum height of 8 feet for vertical clearance.

There are issues with clearance on the inside of curve, due to cyclists' leaning.

AASHTO guidelines are also affected - and are Guidance.

Consensus: Keep as Guidance.

### **9B.09 Selective Exclusion Signs**

The BTC proposed to remove overly-specific wording from this section.

The BTC voted to keep the deletion.

### **9B.20-26 Other Signs.**

9B:20, wayfinding signs, should arrows be at the extremes of the sign? The BTC decided to keep this as a "should".

9B.21 Bike Route signs. FHWA has issued an Interim Approval for the new M1-9 US bike route sign - revised wording conforms to the Interim Approval.

Typo in 9B.23 will be fixed.

9B.24 Reference location sign: display of decimal point and zero numeral is changed to a Guidance statement from Standard. Sign design is addressed in SHS book.

9B.26 No comments.

9C.02 No change except that we consolidated this into one statement. No comments.

## ***Current proposals under review***

### **Bike Boxes**

We have had an exhaustive discussion regarding bike boxes on the BTC list in spring 2012, and did not reach a consensus. The proposal may need to be deconstructed it into its constituent parts: color, bike lane, approach condition, departure lane. Still a significant amount of disagreement in the BTC on the issue.

### **Colored Bike Lanes**

An interim approval was issued by FHWA. MUTCD content will still need to be developed.

## ***Bicycle Merge Sign***

The BTC discussed the proposal for a bicycle merge sign for locations where bicycles must merge with other traffic, such as at the end of a bike lane.

A proposed modified W9-2 had 4 lines of text, too many for glance recognition

A modified W9-10 with a W4-5P plaque also was considered

Discussion:

Who is the audience - bicyclists or motorists?

Traffic law: the merging traffic is supposed to yield.

A R4-11 sign or SLMs could be used downstream if needed.

Markings (such as merge arrows) may be used as well.

Just dumping the cyclist into the street is not OK.

Neither the SLM nor R4-11 will instruct motorists that bicyclists will be moving into the lane. Speed restriction on SLM is limiting.

A bike lane drop can occur where roadway width actually increases, for example approaching an intersection.

The sign may not be appropriate at routine lane drops at intersections.

Part 9 wording should be consistent with Section 2C.42.

Poll of the committee: An optional warning sign with a bike symbol above the words “merge ahead” is popular

Bill DeSantis agreed to take the lead and prepare a proposal for discussion on Thursday.

## ***Future of the MUTCD***

Gene Hawkins spoke briefly about the future of the MUTCD – see <http://mutcd.tamu.edu> for more information.

## ***FHWA report - Bruce Friedman***

Scott Wainwright has retired from the FHWA, and will be returning to the NCUTCD as a member of the Signals Technical Committee. Hari Kalla, who was on a 6 month rotational assignment, is now in another position at the FHWA and is no longer the MUTCD team leader. Chung Eng will be joining the MUTCD team as the new team leader. Until Scott’s vacancy is filled, Eric Ferron is covering pavement markings and Friedman is covering traffic signals in addition to their normal assignments.

A hot-linked version of the MUTCD is online. It is best to download it to your computer or server before using it.

The official rulings database is still being improved, including linking documents related to rulings, interpretations etc., to the database, but that work has been slowed down by the staff vacancies.

FHWA is considering a 2-document set for the next edition of the MUTCD, with the second volume an

application guide. FHWA would be interested in hearing any ideas that NCUTCD members might have about this.

There are 2 new requests for interim approvals from NACTO: bike signals and bike boxes.

### ***Adjournment***

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

# **NCUTCD Bicycle Technical Committee Minutes, June 21, 2012, Orlando, Florida**

Minutes prepared by John S. Allen, July 30, 2012

## ***Attendance***

### **BTC Members**

Richard Moeur, Chair	Bill DeSantis
John LaPlante, Vice Chair	Dan Lang
John Allen, Secretary	Theo Petritsch
John Ciccarelli	Craig Williams
Mike Colety	Ron van Houten
Ted Curtis	

### **Guests**

Nathaniel Frankoski, MikeandNate.com  
Randy McCourt  
Jennifer Bartlett, Sprinkle Consulting  
Chung Eng, MUTCD leader from FHWA (before break).  
Joanne Conrad, TAPCO (arrived after break, left at 4 PM)  
Eagan Foster, City of Dublin, Ohio (arrived and left sometime after 6 PM).

### ***Call to Order***

Chair Richard Moeur called the meeting to order at 1:10 PM.

### ***MikeandNate.com***

Nat Frankoski gave a presentation about his ride south to north across America for the Wounded Warrior project. The Web site is at <http://MikeandNate.wordpress.com>.

### ***Sites Open to Public Travel***

Randy McCourt described the work to define where the MUTCD applies to **sites open to public travel** (SOPuT); these include military bases, but not gated communities, gated toll roads, parking or private railroad crossings.

"If it looks like a road it is a road, but there are some gray areas." (Example: roads at the periphery of parking lots). Parking aisles don't count. Roadway-like facilities count - they are described in the ITE handbook, not the MUTCD.

Zero traffic control is OK on private property if the facility is well-designed. But if there is

traffic control, it should conform to the MUTCD. We don't want to apply 35-45 mph standards to a slower environment.

The process is intended to finish by 2014.

Discussion:

Traffic flow in a parking lot should be intuitively obvious. Many issues are design issues, not MUTCD issues. Focus conflicts and provide clear channelization. Continuity of guidance between public and private spaces is important.

Property owners have responsibility and liability to follow the MUTCD.

Speed bumps are a problem for bicyclists.

Bumper blocks should not be installed except at the periphery.

What can be open to bicycles, not motor vehicles, or vice versa? That is at the property-owner's discretion.

Is there anything in the MUTCD which applies only to public property? (No.)

Land developers, site engineers and traffic engineers all make decisions about traffic on private property. Site engineers may not know that the MUTCD exists.

Concerned about having a separate Part - may need to change wording in multiple places. Perhaps suggested guidance on best practices instead.

If a path comes into a shopping center it should intersect the road properly.

### ***Task Force on Bicycle Signals***

Our lead person on this, Bill Schultheiss, is not at the meeting, but Craig Williams and Ted Curtis attended the Signals Task Force and presented.

The work in the Signals TC is a rather informal exchange. Listing of concerns:

- The bicycle symbol takes up much more of the signal indication area than an arrow, and could be confused with a standard circular "ball" signal. Human factors testing might be useful.
- What operation is it intended for exclusive, protected, permission?
- Mounting height? Lateral separation between heads?
- Flashing operation? Arrows & turning movements?
- Visibility limited? Backplates?
- Timing, as it affects efficiency, safety and compliance?

Much work remains to do on this. Data and reports would be very helpful.

### ***Bicycle merge signs (continued)***

A proposal for a W4 series sign was presented to indicate where bicyclists are merging. This is

intended for use when merging is needed after a long stretch; not before every intersection.

There was a discussion of a few graphic signs. One showed the bicycle merging too late and was rejected on that count. This, and another, could indicate only a merge to the left where a shoulder or bike lane ends, or the road narrows. The sign can be used in conjunction with SLMs.

A new Part 9 Section and sign (to be inserted prior to 9B.19) were developed by the BTC as a working task force, which was submitted after the meeting to Regulatory & Warning Signs TC for concurrence.

### ***Colored Pavement***

Markings TC task force on colored pavement is not ready yet, will get its report to us in the fall.

### ***BTC Officers and Organizational Representation***

NCUTCD Bylaws describe National Committee structure and voting membership - <http://www.ncutcd.org/doc/bylaws.doc>. Technical Committee Chairs are selected by the NCUTCD Board of Directors, Vice-Chair and Secretary of Technical Committees by the Technical Committee Chairs.

New incoming Vice-Chair is John Ciccarelli. He also will be the official representative to the Research Committee. Ron Van Houten also will attend Research meetings.

### ***Uniform Vehicle Code Crosswalk Proposal***

The BTC discussed and voted to approve Ron van Houten's proposal for a revision to the UVC to require roadway traffic in both directions to yield to pedestrians unless the road has a median.

### ***Adjournment***

The meeting adjourned shortly after 5 PM because some members had to go to the Research Task Force meeting, and there would no longer be a quorum.

Next meeting will be January 9-11 2013, Arlington, VA.

### ***UVC Working Group***

A working group remained in the room, and conducted a long discussion of proposals assembled by Allen for revision of the bicycling provisions of the Uniform Vehicle Code. After further formatting work and revision, the proposals were posted to the BTC on July 12 as an e-mail attachment. Allen also has prepared suggestions for provisions about driver distraction. These suggestions are still in review before presentation to the BTC.



### ***Friday Morning General Session***

At the Friday morning session, the NCUTCD Council voted to approve the proposal to modify Part 9 Standards with slight modifications. The proposal as submitted to FHWA is on the BTC site at <http://www.ncutcdbtc.org/sponsors/part9stdsrev-appvd.doc>.