

NCUTCD BTC meeting, Wednesday, June 25, 2014

Minutes

Attendance

BTC members:

Richard Moeur, Chair
John Allen, Secretary
Mike Cynecki
Josh Debruyne
Michelle DeRobertis
Bill DeSantis
Bill Fox

Dwight Kingsbury
Peter Koonce
Rock Miller
Nathan Richman
Bill Schultheiss
Lee Stuart
Craig Williams

Guests:

Melissa Barnes, Minnesota DOT
Jesse Boudart, Kittelson and Associates
Dongho Chang, City of Seattle
Kevin Dunn, FHWA
Jim Kalchbrenner, Pexco Davidson
Kit Keller, APBP

Stewart Robertson, Kimley-Horn
Kirk Roberts, City of Edina, Minnesota
Joe Stafford, Pennsylvania Bicycle Access Council
Ryan Snyder, Ryan Snyder Associates
Peter Speer, Pexco Davidson

Call to Order

Richard Moeur called the meeting to order at 1 PM.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the January 2014 meeting were approved by acclamation.

Membership

Membership stands at 24 now with 12 government and 12 non-government members. Dongho Chang is expected to become a member at tonight's board meeting. In order to maintain 50% + 1 balance per Bylaws, the BTC needs one more government member before we can add another non-government member. Prospective member Ginny Sullivan from Adventure Cycling can't make it to this meeting. Prospective member Ryan Snyder is here.

Updates

FHWA: Victor Mendez is no longer Administrator at the FHWA. Acting Administrator Greg Nadeau has set the September 1, 2014 as the final date for input on MUTCD rulemaking, followed by several months of internal review. In spring 2015, the draft of the new edition of the MUTCD is expected to be published in the Federal Register. The public comment period will close in fall 2015, followed by a year to collate and resolve comments. The new edition of the MUTCD will likely be published in early

2017.

June 2015 will be the one meeting to develop comments on the rulemaking.. The January 2015 meeting will be the "calm before the storm" and offer an opportunity for strategic planning. The standard proposal-development-and-review process should resume in January 2016.

The understanding now is that for the present meeting only, technical committees will be able to make proposals directly to the Council, since sending the proposals out for sponsor comment after this meeting would result in their being too late for inclusion in the next MUTCD..

If a proposal is approved by a Technical Committee but not by Council by the close of this meeting, it can be sent to FHWA, but has to be noted as not being approved by NCUTCD as a whole.

Paul Carlson of Texas A&M, chair of the Research Committee, is trying to put together research problem statements. If any of us has a problem statement, please bring it forward.

What about research on bike lane widths and dooring - is there existing work on this? Answer: apparently ongoing but not complete.

An FHWA draft of revisions to Part 9 which we reviewed earlier was only a working draft. A review of the draft was distributed about a month ago. There might be a new numbering system for chapters and sections. We won't spend much time on that.

Discussion of Comments from Sponsors on Proposals

The discussion touched on a number of items, some editing questions: "bike lanes/bicycle lanes"; placeholders for new text; snowmobiles not on the exclusion list; back-in parking. See documents Part9Rewrite-Dec13.pdf and Part9Rewrite-comms.xls distributed to the BTC in Richard Moeur's e-mail of May 9, 2014.

There was an extended discussion of the proposed revised MUTCD content for Shared Lane Marking (SLM) spacing. Guidance presented in NACTO documents is inconsistent (the ITE Traffic Control Devices Handbook also has SLM recommendations). Consensus was to rewrite SLM spacing as a Guidance condition, including the table. This will be sent directly to FHWA as part of the comment package on the proposed draft Part 9.

The discussion of SLMs continued, addressing additional nonstandard uses: Seattle has used SLMs to indicate a path across railroad tracks. There were also issues with SLMs and parallel railroad tracks. The consensus of the BTC was that an SLM could be in a lane with tracks but not between the rails.

SLMs in buffered bike lanes? No. In bike boxes? No, these are not shared lanes. On shared-use paths or separated/segregated bikeways? No. In a travel lane adjacent to bike lane? No.

Dotted lines next to SLMs get worn off because they are in the tire tracks, and can confuse motorists: Painting the entire lane is expensive. It was noted that the BTC was "leaping ahead" before the data are in. (Experiments are underway in Boston and elsewhere). The committee agreed to delete the section about dotted lines.

A proposal on colored markings developed by Markings TC was not run past the BTC for concurrence. Markings committee is looking at our comments but will want to confer with us before it goes to Council. [Markings TC met with BTC members at 7 PM on June 25 to address this issue.]

Placeholders

There was a discussion of placeholders (i.e., proposed new sections in the draft MUTCD with content not yet developed) in FHWA's draft rewrite of Part 9. At this meeting, the BTC will attempt to address as many of these as is practical in the remaining committee time.

Signage at RR/light rail crossings was discussed. An important issue is how to indicate a line of travel for bicyclists to cross the track at or near a right angle, and to warn motorists. Is the W10-12 good enough? It doesn't tell that bicyclists weave.

"Bicycle jughandles"? Let design guides address this treatment..

SLMs at intersection approaches are not in the placeholder list. We could address this if we have time.

Bicycle detector symbol: problem is if they are on light-colored pavement, they are not visible. Moer: black can be used per Part 3 for contrast on light-colored pavement. Green should be visible against either a light or a black background

Separated bikeways. Schultheiss: keep it simple, with flexposts, maybe only in buffers? DeSantis: Channelizing devices are allowed. It's easier to use what is in the manual. (which manual?)

Except Bicycles warning plaque

We've approved the regulatory plaque and want to add a version for use with warning signs. Minor revisions were made to wording of the proposal. The BTC approved the proposal for submission to the Council, see <http://ncutdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/exceptbikeswarn.doc>. This proposal had already been sent to sponsors.[approved by the Council on June 26.]

Bicycle intersection control signs

We are adding buses, taxis and/or bicycles to 2B 20, the exclusive lane direction sign, and adding an option statement to Part 9. We could increase the width of the sign but there is a problem with wind load – we typically don't mount these on mast arms though. FHWA doesn't want this as a post-mount unless “bike lane” is used with it. Panel will be 30 x 12 inches and say “bike lane” with the symbol. Drawings of both the plaque and sign will be added. The proposals for both were approved - see <http://ncutdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/r3-5hpbikeplaque.doc> and <http://ncutdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/r3-8bikelegend.doc> [approved by Council on June 26.]

Adjournment

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

NCUTCD BTC meeting, Thursday, June 26, 2014

Minutes

Attendance

BTC members:

Richard Moeur, Chair	Dwight Kingsbury
John Allen, Secretary	Peter Koonce
Dongho Chang (new member)	Rock Miller
Mike Cynecki	Nathan Richman
Josh DeBruyn	Bill Schultheiss
Michelle DeRobertis	Lee Stuart
Bill DeSantis	Ron van Houten
Bill Fox	Craig Williams

Guests:

Jim Kalchbrenner, Pexco Davidson	Ryan Snyder, Ryan Snyder Associates
Kit Keller, APBP	Kirk Roberts, City of Edina, Minnesota
Joe Stafford, Pennsylvania Bicycle Access Council	Stewart Robertson, Kimley-Horn

Joint Meeting with Signals Technical Committee

A joint meeting with Signals TC was held in the morning to finalize the proposed MUTCD content on bicycle traffic signals. The assembled group review, modified, and approved the content for presentation to Council by Signals TC.

Richard Moeur reconvened the BTC around 11:15 AM, following the joint meeting with the Signals TC.

Non-numbered Bicycle Route Sign

The BTC reviewed comments from sponsors. The main item of discussion was that the word "pictograph," which we had used in the text, doesn't fit the definition for one type of proposed sign. This was changed to "graphic".

The proposal was approved [concurrent by GMITC and approved by Council later on June 26].

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at noon for lunch and the afternoon General Session.

NCUTCD BTC meeting, Friday, June 27, 2014

Minutes

Attendance

BTC members:

Richard Moeur, Chair
John Allen, Secretary
Dongho Chang
Mike Cynecki
Josh DeBruyn (morning)
Michelle DeRobertis
Bill DeSantis
Bill Fox

Dwight Kingsbury
Peter Koonce
Rock Miller
Nathan Richman
Bill Schultheiss
Ron van Houten (afternoon)
Craig Williams

Guests:

Jesse Boudart, Kittelson and Associates
Harry Campbell, Virginia DOT
Ray Derr, TRB
Kevin Dunn, FHWA
Gene Hawkins, NCUTCD Vice-Chair
Jameelah Hayes, AASHTO

Jim Kalchbrenner, Pexco Davidson
Kit Keller, APBP
Bill Lambert, New Hampshire DOT
Stewart Robertson, Kimley-Horn
Ryan Snyder, Ryan Snyder Associates
Joe Stafford, Pennsylvania Bicycle Access Council

Call to Order

Richard Moeur called the meeting to order at 8 AM.

Council Report

Non-numbered route signs were approved by the GMI TC, and unanimously in the Thursday Council meeting, including the use of the word “graphic” instead of “pictograph”- see <http://ncutcdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/nonnumbbikeroute.doc>. We are 4 and zero so far on approval of proposals.

Turning Vehicles Yield to Bicycles Sign

The BTC to this point had not done anything yet on this proposal, which had been requested by the FHWA. There is already a R10-15 Turning Vehicles Yield to Pedestrians sign in the MUTCD which uses a busy “sign within a sign” design. BTC members were not happy with this sign, on grounds of its readability: Portland, Oregon has introduced a more graphic sign. However, introducing a different type of design would result in complications in the approval process and so a brief proposal was developed for two modified versions of the R10-15, one for bicyclists only and another for bicyclists and pedestrians. The proposal is online at <http://ncutcdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/r10-15bike.doc>. The proposal now goes directly to Council [approved by Council on June 28]. There are issues with usage of this sign, but they could not be addressed in the light of the FHWA request.

Wayfinding Signs for Shared-Use Paths

BTC member Michael Jackson had been hoping to move to approval of this proposal for several years, but also there was a request from FHWA. These are not directional (route) signs, but signs pointing to places of interest or services which can be on or off the route: bike shop, food, public park, etc. The GMI technical committee would like to see this before it goes to Council. Our proposal was mostly based on section 2D.50 of the MUTCD. There was a discussion and several changes were made to the proposal. Moeur passed the proposal to the Guide and Motorist Information (GMI) Technical Committee.

The BTC divided into working groups to shape up remaining proposals. Jesse Boudart, a guest at the meeting, deserves credit for assisting with several figures needed to complete proposals.

Moeur returned from GMI with a report that GMI agreed on the concept of wayfinding signs but that we should not duplicate content in Part 2. Moeur had drafted a much shorter proposal which made references to section 2D.50 rather than duplicating its content. The BTC discussed and approved this proposal, with minor modifications. It was passed to GMI again, and was approved for presentation to Council - see <http://ncutcdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/pathwayfinding.doc>.

Bike Boxes

Markings TC also had concurred with the proposal on bike boxes which the BTC had prepared at the January meeting and which had already been reviewed by sponsors. We discussed comments from sponsors. The figures still needed work. Completion of this proposal was tabled till later in the day for work on figures.

Bike-Lane Extensions Through Intersections

This proposal originated as a request from FHWA. Several types of markings could be used. Dotted lines are approved; shared-lane markings are not. Dual chevrons (shared-lane markings without the bicycle symbol) could be used, but would need to be called by a different name, as chevrons have a specific definition in the MUTCD. The proposal was revised and approved - see <http://ncutcdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/blextension.doc>. The proposal now goes directly to Council [approved by Council on June 28].

Buffered Bike Lanes

The BTC next discussed buffered bike lanes. This proposal originated with a request from FHWA and had already been reviewed by sponsors. Comments from sponsors were reviewed. There was an extended discussion of what types of buffer markings are acceptable. This discussion was tabled until later in the day, pending further work on figures.

Contraflow Bike Lanes

The BTC next discussed contraflow bicycle lanes, resulting in modifications to the proposal which Michelle de Robertis had prepared. A major issue was striping. Comments from sponsors were reviewed. There was a discussion of signage and markings to allay confusion which may occur to drivers and pedestrians expecting one-way traffic. Do Not Enter signs should be used instead of One Way signs, as two-way traffic will be on the roadway (only bikes in one of the two directions). Wording permitting motor-vehicle parking between the contraflow lane and the curb was deleted. The modified proposal was approved - see <http://ncutcdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/contraflowbikelane.doc> [approved by Council on June 28].

Buffered Bike Lanes Redux

Responses from sponsors were read. Proposed figures were discussed and revised. The BTC approved the proposal for presentation to Council - see <http://ncutcdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/bufferbikelane.doc> [approved by Council on June 28].

Bike Box Redux

Jesse Boudart presented a drawing, and the revised bike box proposal was approved for presentation to Council - see <http://ncutcdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/bikebox.doc> [approved by Council on June 28].

Two-stage Turn Queuing Box

This had been requested by the FHWA. Allen and DeSantis drafted a proposal. Changes were made in the text, and a figure which Jesse Boudart had prepared was revised. The proposal was approved - see <http://ncutcdbtc.org/sponsors/spr14/2stagerturnbox.doc>. The proposal now goes directly to Council [approved by Council on June 28].

Separated Bikeways

These were discussed but no proposal moved to completion. Discussion will be continued after the meeting on the Google Groups list to see if an acceptable proposal can be developed. [A proposal was developed, but did not receive a full vote of the BTC prior to the FHWA deadline.]

Contrast Markings:

Following on Wednesday's discussion, there was a brief discussion with input from Gene Hawkins, former chair of Markings TC. Koonce is advocating green-backed bicycle detector markings for use on concrete pavement, and indicated that they improve compliance even on dark pavement; but there is as of yet no formal proposal. Green backgrounds behind shared-lane markings also might be used, but FHWA up to now has disallowed rectangular green backgrounds under shared-lane markings, as research did not support its use. Black backgrounds are acceptable everywhere for contrast on light-colored pavement.

Bicycle Treatments at Railroad Crossings

A project on bicycle treatments at rail crossings has been submitted to a pooled-fund study, but results will not be available till after the NPA. We recommend against putting something into the NPA until after the study. FHWA can take care of that.

Bike Lane Markings and Raised Devices

There was a discussion of the wording on markings for bicycle lanes and of the support for not having raised devices adjacent to bike lanes. The wording "posts" in the prohibition was changed to "non-flexible posts." We don't have research data to support making a statement either to remove the prohibition on raised devices or not. The wording of the support statement preventing raised pavement markers etc. could be a problem. The proposal will be further developed by the BTC. [Discussion continued on the proposal on the BTC Google Groups list, but the proposal did not receive a full vote of the BTC prior to the FHWA deadline].

Services Signs for Bikeways

This was briefly discussed, but will be addressed as a future proposal.

Adjournment and Future Meetings

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 PM. Next meeting will be in Arlington, Virginia as usual, January 5-7 2015, a 3-day meeting. and will be a “catch-up” meeting to cover issues which have been left unaddressed due to the pressure to complete work on new proposals for the upcoming edition of the MUTCD. The June 2015 meeting will be June 17 to 19 or 20 at the Hilton Palacio del Rio on the Riverwalk in downtown San Antonio, Texas.