**Selected sections dealing with bicycling from the minutes of the Aug 2017 meeting of the Calif. Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)**

**17-14: IA 20: Interim Approval for Optional Use of Two-Stage Bicycle Turn Boxes**

Executive Secretary Talada stated that IA 20 was issued by the FHWA on July 13, 2017. There are two ongoing experiments concerning this experimental traffic control device, at the City of Sacramento and the Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT). The IA was reviewed by the Electrical Systems Branch; they found no safety issues and it can be implemented on the state highway system.

CTCDC feedback was sought on whether the IA needed any modification or whether it was wanted in California.

**MOTION**: Committee Member Bahadori moved to approve the use of the FHWA IA in California. Committee Member Winter seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

………..

**15-15: Striping a space for bicycle use at locations with right-turn-only lanes**

Rachel Carpenter, Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety Branch Chief, Caltrans Division of Traffic Operations, reported that this item had been on the agenda three meetings ago but had not been addressed. A subcommittee had subsequently reviewed the item and was now bringing the item back for approval.

The Caltrans Division of Design implemented this Advisory Standard, which applies even if there is no bike lane present.

It is recommended that the CA MUTCD allow as an optional provision a delineated space for bike use between the right-turn lane and through lane when no bike lane exists on the approach. The proposal revises Section 9C-04 Markings for Bicycle Lanes to include standards, guidance, and options related to striping a 4-foot wide space for bike use between the right turn and through lane. Varying striping is recommended depending on the speed.

The goal is to standardize existing practice in many places in the state.

**MOTION**: Committee Member Tong moved to adopt the language with a change to paragraph 9e to “optional use;” the language will be modified and brought back to the committee. Committee Member Bahadori seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

……………

**16-11: Proposed changes to the Shared Lane Markings Section 9C.07**

Committee Member Sallaberry stated that the item was an effort to update language in the MUTCD about shared lane markings.

Ms. Carpenter reported that this item also had not been heard at the December 6 meeting.

She stated that the subcommittee had referred to a number of sources in developing the proposal. A number of today’s recommendations come from the ITE Traffic Control Devices Handbook.

Ms. Carpenter explained the proposal. It adds three options statements regarding use of the shared marking.

• The first assists bicyclists with lateral positioning within a traffic circle or roundabout.

• The second supplements a signed bicycle route identified as a Class III bikeway or bike route.

• The third encourages the lateral positioning of bicyclists away from on-street angled parking.

A section called Lateral Positioning was being proposed. It includes support and guidance statements; the first relates to effective lane width.

A slight modification is proposed to paragraph 4 regarding shared lanes with on-street parallel parking.

Additional paragraphs related to spacing are being recommended along with Figure 9C-109.

**MOTION**: Committee Member Tong moved to adopt the proposed language changing 6A, 6B and 6C to “may”; deleting paragraph 05a at the top of page 24; and changing the graphics in Figure 9C-109 to single sharrow. Committee Member Walter seconded.

Committee Member Jones requested a change the double asterisk in Figure 9C-109 regarding the shared lane markings appropriate to assist bicycles: some agencies might want to have an additional sharrow beyond the queue. Committee Member Tong accepted this as a Friendly Amendment.

**VOTE**: The Motion passed unanimously.

…………….

**17-19: Proposal to create a standing committee to review proposed changes to Part 9**

Committee Member Tong stated that currently the CTCDC has a subcommittee for the items concerning bicycles. It would be beneficial to have a standing subcommittee for such items and for it to retain some of the same members.

Committee Member Walter recommended having a city and a county representative on the standing committee – they would be very much involved in the implementation of traffic control devices for the roadways of which their agency is in charge.

Committee Member Winter asked about California Bicycle Advisory Committee (CBAC) membership on the subcommittee. Committee Member Tong answered that the existing subcommittee has a CBAC member, as would the standing subcommittee.

Committee Member Sallaberry asked about the need for this subcommittee; it seems like every item that comes through CTCDC has a sponsor. It is up to the sponsor to ensure that the item is clear, makes sense, and is ready for presentation to the CTCDC. Doing the legwork is up to the sponsor. Having a standing subcommittee seems excessive. Committee Member Tong responded that the upcoming bicycle items are complex.

Chair Greenwood reiterated that the subcommittee formed after the December meeting does not have full representation: it lacks city and county membership. He recommended to expand the membership if the CTCDC continues to use it.

Committee Member Bahadori felt that it would help the CTCDC to have detailed discussions done ahead of time in such a subcommittee.

Committee Member Jones reported that the current subcommittee had spent five or six hours in preparation for today’s two items. The committee does have a city professional engineer and three Caltrans professional engineers. It also has representatives from the advocacy organizations, who have many different opinions on how people should or should not be riding bicycles.

[No decision or action is reported in the Minutes.]

**9. Tabled Items**

**16-30: Proposed edits to CA MUTCD for Class IV Bikeway**