**Ideas To Ponder In Regard to Bike Lane Buffers**

1. Our bike buffer section (9C-104) within our CA MUTCD ***DOES NOT YET EXIST*** within the **National MUTCD**. California is leading the way in this regard – **so let’s get it right**.
2. Should/Must bike buffers contain chevrons, hash marks or other internal separation features – and not just a series of confusing parallel lines as shown in the Santa Barbara buffered bike lane example?
3. Should our future CA MUTCD buffer section (9C-104 (CA) be **divided into two or more sections to better differentiate the intended purpose of the buffer** – such as ………………

a) **Traffic Separator Buffers**…… which will be 2’ or more feet wide and whose main purpose it to separate vehicular traffic from cyclists……………..”

b) **Dooring Buffers**…. “Dooring buffers are installed parallel to parking stalls and must start at least 7-8’ from the right or left curb (as needed) and be least 3 feet wide to be effective as door buffers …….”

1. The buffer line adjacent to the traffic lane must be 6” wide – all other lines are to be 4” wide or do we want everything 6” wide?.
2. **Artistic Buffers** - based upon the response I got from the FHWA in regard to artistic/decorative buffers used in conjunction with bikeways our MUTCD should state something to the effect that

…… “Artistic/decorative buffers are not permitted in that they are traffic control devices and must follow FHWA guideline”………..

1. Buffers as currently detailed in our CA MUTCD might conflict with CVC 21651 which prohibits

crossing continuous traffic separators of various types. Does the CVC need to be updated/changed?

1. To clearly differentiate between standard traffic separators and bike lane separators, should we consider the use of **green buffer lines** and change the CVC & MUTCD to allow their use?