



California Traffic Control Devices Committee Agenda Item Report



Meeting Date: October 2, 2025 Item Number: 25-13	From: Mike Malyy & Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans
Sponsored By: Amjad Obeid, Caltrans	Presented By: Mike Malyy & Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans
Description: Request for review and recommendation to finalize CA MUTCD 2026 Part 9 titled "Traffic Control For Bicycle Facilities" proposed documents that have been revised in response to 8/7/25 CTCDC Meeting comments and is being prepared to adopt Federal Highway Administration's National MUTCD 2023 (11th Edition) before the January 18, 2026, deadline.	

Recommendation:

Motion by committee, recommending Caltrans to finalize and prepare the CA MUTCD 2026 Part 9 titled "Traffic Control For Bicycle Facilities" draft documents and incorporate them into CA MUTCD 2026 version that is being prepared to adopt Federal Highway Administration's National MUTCD 2023 (11th Edition) before the January 18, 2026, deadline.

Agency Making Request/Sponsor:

Mike Malyy & Johnny Bhullar, Caltrans / Amjad Obeid, Caltrans

Background:

For detailed background on this item, including the previously proposed revisions upon which the CTCDC provided comments shared below were based, as well as the meeting minutes of the meeting discussions, please refer to agenda item 25-13 document and its attachments, that were included in the August 7, 2025, meeting and are available at: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/safety-programs/ctcdc/meetings>.

This item was discussed previously in the August 7, 2025, meeting. During the meeting, several CTCDC members and FHWA CA Division representative shared their comments and concerns on the proposed revisions. The meeting discussions resulted in the CTCDC providing multiple comments to Caltrans and requesting Caltrans to review and address these comments, as appropriate. Caltrans was asked to revise these draft documents based on review of the CTCDC comments and provide them to CTCDC for review and discussion in a future meeting. Summary of the CTCDC comments provided on August 7, 2025, meeting and Caltrans review, response and resolution to these comments, is as follows:

1. CTCDC Comment – Chapter 9A, Section 9A.01, Paragraph 08:

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal includes text:

"Separated bikeways should be accessible to street maintenance equipment (e.g., street sweeping, snow removal)."

CTCDC member comment: This provision is not directly related to traffic control devices. It is a design guidance and should not be included in the document.

Caltrans agrees with comment and proposal text has been deleted.

2. **CTCDC Comment – Chapter 9A, Section 9A.03, Paragraph 02:**

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal includes text:

“Pavement marking word messages, symbols, and/or arrows and/or colored pavement should be used in bikeways where appropriate.”

CTCDC member comment: Consider changing this text to Option rather than Guidance, as meaning of "where appropriate" may be subjective.

Caltrans agrees with comment and the proposal text has been revised as follows:

Option:

02 Pavement marking word messages, symbols, ~~and/or~~ arrows, and/or colored pavement may ~~should~~ be used in bikeways where appropriate.

3. **CTCDC Comment – Figure 9A-1:**

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal: Figure depicts sign placement on shared-use paths.

CTCDC member comment: Suggest including a note to refer to State and Federal ADA standards for sign requirements when shared-use path is adjacent to sidewalks.

CTCDC member comment: Intent of the figure was to keep it simple and include all traversable space, paved or unpaved, including shoulders and sidewalks.

Caltrans agrees with comment and a note has been added to the figure.

4. **CTCDC Comment – Chapter 9B, Section 9B.02, Paragraph 05:**

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal includes text that requires the use of "Stop Here for Pedestrians" Signs.

CTCDC member comment: Delete "Stop Here for Pedestrians" Signs from the text.

Caltrans agrees with comment and the proposal text has been revised as follows:

05 The EXCEPT BICYCLES regulatory plaque shall not be used to exempt bicyclists from the legal requirement of a STOP or YIELD sign, Yield Here to Pedestrians Signs, ~~Stop Here for Pedestrians Signs~~, or a traffic signal indication.

5. **CTCDC Comment – Chapter 9B, Section 9B.04, Paragraph 08:**

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal includes text:

“Supplementing any sign that is installed on the signal mast arm with a plaque needs to accommodate for the additional wind load of the plaque.”

CTCDC member comment: Seems like this is a more general comment about installation and probably is better placed in either the traffic signal section or the general installation requirements for signs rather than specific to the bike lane sign.

Caltrans agrees with comment and proposal text has been deleted.

6. **CTCDC Comment – Chapter 9B, Section 9B.12, Paragraph 04:**

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal includes text that requires the use of "Stop Here for Pedestrians" Signs.

CTCDC member comment: Delete "Stop Here for Pedestrians" Signs from the text.

Caltrans agrees with comment and the proposal text has been revised as follows:

04 The Bicycles Yield to Peds sign shall not be used in conjunction with a STOP or YIELD sign, Yield Here to Pedestrians Sign, ~~or a Stop Here for Pedestrians Sign.~~

7. **CTCDC Comment – Chapter 9B, Section 9B.15, Paragraph 01a:**

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal includes text:

"In situations where there is a need to remind motorists to pass bicyclists with sufficient lateral clearance in compliance with CVC 21760 (Three Feet for Safety Act) the Bicycle Passing Clearance (R4-19) sign may be used."

CTCDC member comment: Caltrans Legal should look this over in terms of its impact of potentially creating liability should there be a collision on a road where signs were not added to remind motorists.

Caltrans agrees with comment and the proposed text has been reviewed by Caltrans Legal and no issues with were identified.

8. **CTCDC Comment – Chapter 9B, Section 9B.101, Paragraph 01a:**

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal includes provisions to install a Bike Turn-Out sign in advance of the turn-out area.

CTCDC member comment: In the case of automobiles there is signage that specifically states slow vehicles must use turnouts, and we don't necessarily have parallel language with the bike lane turnouts where bicycles must use turnouts.

Caltrans explained that the difference is that vehicles are covered by a specific California Vehicle Code, while no such language exists for bicycles. The issue came up in one district where the roadway grade and other conditions made it impossible for bicyclists to move out of the lane, causing vehicles to stack up behind them. To solve this, bike turnouts were designed and added to projects, and signs were created for those locations. Because no Vehicle Code section directly covers bicyclists in this situation, the language could only go as far as

"should" rather than "shall." These smaller signs were a unique solution developed specifically for bike turnouts to give bicyclists a safe way to let vehicles pass.

9. **CTCDC Comment – Figure 9B-1 (CA):**

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal: Figure depicts California Regulatory Signs and Plaques for Bicycle Facilities.

CTCDC member comment: Why the R81 sign is absent from section C and we are moving to the previously prohibited R3-17 3 sign?

CTCDC member comment: In the figures in chapter 9E, you are still showing a number of instances of the R81 sign instead of the R3-17. The simplicity of the R81 had a very strong influence on the design of the R3-17. The signs are very similar with one another and hopefully the transition process to the national sign will go smoothly.

Caltrans explained that in the interest of national uniformity, California has adopted a lot more signs that the FHWA and the other states are using. We have been grandfathered in to use a number of California-only signs since 2004 and current review included the ending of the grandfather clause. We are moving away from the California R81s and adopting the federal R3-17, which were previously crossed out. References to R81 have been deleted.

10. **CTCDC Comment – Chapter 9D, Section 9D.03, Paragraphs 06 and 07:**

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal includes text:

"The BIKE ROUTE plaque and the Street Name sign may be different widths. Support:"

CTCDC member comment: "Support" at the end of the statement is supposed to go with Paragraph 07.

Caltrans agrees with comment and the proposal text has been revised as follows:

Option:

06 The BIKE ROUTE plaque and the Street Name sign may be different widths.

Support:

07 Figure 9D-3 shows an example of bicycle guide signing using the BIKE ROUTE plaque.

11. **CTCDC Comment – Chapter 9D, Section 9D.13, Paragraphs 03 and 04:**

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal includes text:

"Section 9E.11 contains information regarding pavement markings for two-stage bicycle turn boxes. Option:"

CTCDC member comment: "Option" at the end of the statement is supposed to go with Paragraph 04.

Caltrans agrees with comment and the proposal text has been revised as follows:

03 Section 9E.11 contains information regarding pavement markings for two-stage bicycle turn boxes.

Option:

04 Where a two-stage bicycle turn box is provided, the Two-Stage Bicycle Turn Box guide sign series (see Figure 9D-1) may be used.

12. CTCDC Comment – [Chapter 9D, Section 9D.101, Paragraph 03:](#)

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal includes text:

"Street Name (D3-1 or D3-1a or G7-1(CA)) signs identifying the overcrossing structure over a Class I or IV bikeway may be installed on the overcrossing structure. If sign installation on the overcrossing is not practical, roadside sign installation may be considered."

CTCDC member comment: The MUTCD now addresses street name signs and overcrossing structures. Figure 2H-4, I2-3 and I2-3A is the new name for the street name signs at overcrossings.

Caltrans agrees with comment and the proposal text has been revised as follows:

03 Street Name (I2-3 and I2-3A) signs identifying the overcrossing structure over a Class I or IV bikeway may be installed on the overcrossing structure. If sign installation on the overcrossing is not practical, roadside sign installation may be considered.

13. CTCDC Comment – [Chapter 9E, Section 9E.02, Paragraph 03b:](#)

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal includes text:

"Where through motor vehicle lanes approaching an intersection become mandatory turn lanes adjacent bike lanes should be delineated using Figures 9E-4 and 9E-4(CA)."

CTCDC member comment: Formatting needs to be fixed.

Caltrans agrees with comment and the proposal text has been revised as follows:

03 *Where through motor vehicle lanes approaching an intersection become mandatory turn lanes, adjacent bike lanes should be delineated using Figures 9E-4 and 9E-4(CA).*

14. CTCDC Comment – [Chapter 9E, Section 9E.02, Paragraph 08:](#)

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal includes text:

"Where there is insufficient width in the roadway to include both a bicycle lane and a general-purpose turn lane, bicycle travel may be accommodated within the turn lane or general-purpose lane using shared-lane markings."

CTCDC member comment: Consider mentioning the fact that state law has limited the use of those markings on roads over 30 miles an hour.

Caltrans explained that this information is covered in Section 9E.09, Paragraph 03a.

15. CTCDC Comment – [Chapter 9E, Section 9E.03, Paragraph 03:](#)

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal includes text:

"The width and color of lane extension markings are discussed in Section 3B.11. Option:"

CTCDC member comment: "Option" at the end of the statement is supposed to go with Paragraph 04.

Caltrans agrees with comment and the proposal text has been revised as follows:

03 The width and color of lane extension markings are discussed in Section 3B.11.

Option:

04 The bicycle symbol, the arrow marking, pavement word markings, or a combination thereof may be used in bicycle lane extensions through intersections.

16. CTCDC Comment – [Chapter 9E, Section 9E.07, Paragraph 03a:](#)

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal includes text:

"See Figure 9E-106 (CA). See Caltrans' Design Information Bulletin Number 89 Class IV Bikeway Guidance (Separated Bikeways/Cycle Tracks) (DIB 89-02) for more information."

CTCDC member comment: Consider revising to state DIB 89-02 or latest edition, to ensure that the reference is valid throughout the life of the Manual, in case DIB receives an update.

Caltrans agrees with comment and the proposal text has been revised as follows:

03a See Figure 9E-106 (CA). See Caltrans' Design Information Bulletin Number 89 Class IV Bikeway Guidance (Separated Bikeways/Cycle Tracks) for more information.

17. CTCDC Comment – [Chapter 9E, Section 9E.07, Paragraph 05:](#)

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal includes text:

"BIKE LANE (R3-17) signs (see Figure 9B-1) should be used to distinguish a separated bicycle lane from a general-purpose lane. Refer to Paragraph 00a and 00b in this section."

CTCDC member comment: In May 2024, an Agenda Item 24-05 was proposed the use of "Cycle Track" sign for Class IV Bikeways. Current guidance only mentions sign R3-17, but there's no mention of the proposed sign. Is there an update?

Caltrans explained that no decision has been made to introduce a new sign for Class IV Bikeways. This item was not discussed during SME meetings, but further discussion on this topic is warranted.

18. CTCDC Comment – [Chapter 9E, Section 9E.09, Paragraph 05:](#)

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal includes text:

"Green-colored pavement shall not be applied as a background to shared-lane markings (see Section 3H.06)."

CTCDC member comment: Green underneath sharrows is deleted. I'd like to see Caltrans request the MUTCD team and FHWA to reconsider and allow the use of the green under the sharrows.

CTCDC member comment: Green with a sharrow seems very much in line with the use of green overall for designation of bike lanes or bikeways. Reconsider deletion.

Caltrans acknowledged the comment and explained that FHWA produced the new standard, and justification is needed to revise the proposed text. At this time, Caltrans does not have a justification for deletion or revision of proposed text.

19. CTCDC Comment – [Figure 9E-1:](#)

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal: Figure depicts word, symbol, and arrow pavement markings for bicycle lanes.

CTCDC member comment: Helmeted bicyclist symbol has been deleted. It is the most popular stencil used. The word-only one is probably the least popular. It requires more paint, and the visibility of the letters is poor compared to the symbols. Reconsider deletion.

CTCDC member comment: The symbol is broadly recognized regardless of language, and it is distinct from the bike symbol which is often paired with sharrows. Could the Helmeted Rider symbol be retained in this edition?

CTCDC member comment: It is not clear the logic behind removing the helmeted cyclists in favor of word messages that may not be understood by all and requires more paint or more marketing material. The arbitrary decision to delete it should be reconsidered.

CTCDC member comment: National Committee in Docket Comment 4800 recommended that it be retained. California is not the only state that is concerned about this issue. Other states in their state supplements and manuals have brought forward the retention of the Figure. FHWA is being uniform in rejecting all requests for that.

Caltrans acknowledged the comment and explained that FHWA does not grant the authority over symbols to the States, and they have eliminated the helmeted bicyclist symbol from this iteration of MUTCD.

20. CTCDC Comment – [Figure 9E-6\(CA\)](#):

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal: Figure depicts examples of Markings for Buffer-Separated Bicycle Lanes.

CTCDC member comment: This one pertains to the figures in general, and it's about a slight inconsistency that I think should be uniformly applied to all figures. In some instances, the figures are identifying a particular striping detail, indicating Detail 39A as an example, Figure 9E-6(CA) (Sheet 1 of 2) detail A. And Figure 9E-6 (CA) (Sheet 2 of 2) detail C is referencing a 6-inch dotted white line. There's no specification for dotted or dashed lines and no standardized reference for how those are to be installed. Also, figure shows diagonal lane markings in between the parking lanes and the bike lane, without specifying the spacing between diagonals.

Caltrans acknowledged the comment and explained that detail references have been deleted to avoid providing design guidance. Other figures were reviewed and references to specific details were deleted. Regarding the spacing of diagonal markings, Figure 9E-6 Detail B shows that "spacing for chevron or diagonal markings should be 10 feet or greater."

21. CTCDC Comment – [Figure 9E-6](#):

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal: Figure depicts examples of Markings for Buffer-Separated Bicycle Lanes.

CTCDC member comment: Several locations are showing parking on the other side of several solid lines. Verify that we are not creating any double parallel line conflicts with parked cars entering or exiting the parking.

Caltrans acknowledged the comment and explained that the markups did not show up properly on the document. Added strikethroughs to federal Figure 9E-6 Drawings B and D. Figure 9E-6(CA) Drawing B shows a similar situation as federal Figure 9E-6 Drawing B, but without the multiple parallel solid white lines. New Drawing D was added to Figure 9E-6(CA), to show the same information as federal Figure 9E-6 Drawing D but without the multiple parallel solid white lines.

22. CTCDC Comment – [Figure 9E-106 \(CA\) \(Sheet 3 of 4\)](#):

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal: Figure depicts examples of Markings for Separated Bikeways.

CTCDC member comment: Detail H shows on-street accessible parking stall and the bike lane is doing a very radical shift, and it doesn't appear that there's an appropriate transition length for bicyclists to such a transition. The alignment is likely the results for ADA compliance. There are other situations where you have a bus loading zone and the curb adjacent to bus loading zone, where the bus is parking in the vehicular travel way and the curbs project out into the travel area. And

bicyclists are directed up a ramp onto the sidewalk right across the front of the bus doors and then back down into the bike lanes. In those cases, bicyclists are being directed into accessible routes used by disabled people. Is there opportunity in this case to avoid sudden transitions like that, which would likely be ignored by bicyclists, to have that bike lane project straight through?

CTCDC member comment: And it may be that you just need to add a footnote. A better description of ADA compliance, and at the same time trying to limit the jogging of the bike lane facility. Especially on steep downhill grades, it becomes more problematic for bicyclists to navigate through that.

Caltrans agreed with the comment and explained that these figures are simplistic depictions and do not provide design guidance. Such tapers need to be designed according to ADA requirements. Currently, only DIB 82 provides design guidance for ADA, and will incorporate PROWAG once it is adopted by DOJ. A note has been added to see DIB 82 for ADA requirements.

23. CTCDC Comment – Figure 9E-106 (CA) (Sheet 4 of 4):

CA MUTCD 2026 Proposal: Figure depicts examples of Markings for Separated Bikeways.

CTCDC member comment: Similar to previous comment, Detail I shows a shift away from curb that brings bicyclists closer to the road. Why do the bicyclists need to be brought closer to the travel lanes and why can't they go straight through?

Caltrans acknowledged the comment and explained that figures present options for various situations. Majority of the time, bike lane would go straight through the intersection, as shown in Detail J. Detail I provides an example of a bike lane shift in case there is a situation that prevents bicyclists from continuing straight through, such as an obstruction that needs to be avoided.

24. CTCDC Comment – General Comment:

CTCDC member comment: This is supposed to be a Manual simply specifying traffic control devices, not design. In reality, the CA MUTCD and the MUTCD have dove pretty deeply into the design. I hope we do move away from the MUTCD or CA MUTCD providing design guidance and instead specify standardized traffic control devices. it's a far, far larger effort that needs to be done nationally too.

CTCDC member comment: There has been a long discussion about what aspects of design should be in the MUTCD even since the First Edition, there's always been some small amount of design information. This has been discussed a lot at the National Committee. The MUTCD focuses on traffic control devices, the cleaner it can be.

Caltrans acknowledges and agrees with the comment that MUTCD needs to reduce the design guidance. Because it would take a lot of effort and time,

Caltrans intends to review each section for design guidance as revisions are introduced on case-by-case basis.

Caltrans has prepared the finalized proposal on CA MUTCD 2026 Part 9, incorporating CTCDC recommendation and Caltrans decisions, and it is attached to this agenda item. It is being provided for review to the CTCDC members and the public to share Caltrans decision on the CTCDC comments that were provided. Upon receiving formal CTCDC recommendation to finalize CA MUTCD 2026 Part 9 proposal, it will be revised as per the CTCDC passing motion details and then submitted to FHWA CA Division for review and determination of "substantial conformance" finding with the National MUTCD 2023 (11th Edition).

Attachments:

- Attachment #1 – CA MUTCD 2026 Chapter 9A Draft (Text)
- Attachment #2 – CA MUTCD 2026 Chapter 9A Draft (Figures)
- Attachment #3 – CA MUTCD 2026 Chapter 9A Draft (Tables)
- Attachment #4 – CA MUTCD 2026 Chapter 9B Draft (Text)
- Attachment #5 – CA MUTCD 2026 Chapter 9B Draft (Figures)
- Attachment #6 – CA MUTCD 2026 Chapter 9C Draft (Text)
- Attachment #7 – CA MUTCD 2026 Chapter 9C Draft (Figures)
- Attachment #8 – CA MUTCD 2026 Chapter 9D Draft (Text)
- Attachment #9 – CA MUTCD 2026 Chapter 9D Draft (Figures)
- Attachment #10 – CA MUTCD 2026 Chapter 9E Draft (Text)
- Attachment #11 – CA MUTCD 2026 Chapter 9E Draft (Figures)
- Attachment #12 – CA MUTCD 2026 Chapter 9F Draft (Text)