Caltrans District-4 Bicycle Advisory Committee

Minutes
January 20, 2010 1:30 – 3:30
District 4 Headquarters, Mountain View Room, 15th Floor,
111Grand Avenue, Oakland

Attendance:
Ina Gerhard, Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Coordinator
Michelle DeRobertis, Chair, Santa Clara VTA
Sean Co, MTC
Robert Raburn, EBBC
Alan Forkosh, CABO (via telephone)
Bruce "Ole" Olsen, Delta Pedalers
Robert Cronin, SVBC
Paul Goldstein, SVBC
Wynn Kageyama, Freemont Freewheeling Bicycle Club
Leo Du Bose, EBBC
Christine Culver, Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition (via telephone)
Tim Doherty, BCDC, Oakland Coordination
Midori Tabata, Oakland BPAC
Jason Patton, Oakland Bike/Ped Program Manager
Gail Payne, ACTIA Consultant
Glen Kirby, ACTIA BPAC
Mo Pazooki, Caltrans Toll Bridge Design
Christine Lillie, Caltrans Environmental, Biological Sciences and Permits
Gregory Pera, Caltrans Environmental, Biological Sciences and Permits
Jonathan Dwyer, Caltrans D4 Traffic Safety Branch
Jerilyn Struven, Caltrans Caltrans Signage
Andrew Casteel, BABC
Carlos Babcock, SVBC

Item 1. Welcome and Introductions

Item 2. City of Oakland Bikeway Signage Presentation and Discussion of Regional Bikeway Signage to Dumbarton Bridge – Jason Patton, City of Oakland/ All

The BCDC permit for the Dumbarton Bridge seismic retrofit project requires Caltrans to improve access to the bridge by installing bikeway signage to connect Union City BART and Freemont BART with Menlo Park. This item constitutes the preliminary discussion of what uniform bicycle wayfinding signage might look like on possible regional bike routes that lead to the bridge. A good example for bikeway signage was developed by the city of Oakland as presented by Jason Patton. His PowerPoint presentation, available at http://www.oaklandbikes.info/AssetFactory.aspx?did=3758 , detailed content, layout and placement of signs. Although it was noted that this signage goes beyond present MUTCD guidelines, some of the expected revisions in the MUTCD will encompass the present

inconsistencies. Mr. Pazooki stated that Caltrans is planning to meet with Fremont, Union City, Menlo Park and Newark probably in May 2010 to discuss details. Developed and proposed signage will be presented to the D4 BAC for review and comment. It was suggested that a follow-up meeting be set up among the bicycle coalitions, the above municipalities plus East Palo Alto, and Caltrans to develop a draft signage plan by early May that all the jurisdictions can agree upon. Mr. Pazooki said that Caltrans could then provide consistent signs, poles, and hardware to the cities, along with possible installation.

Further information about the Oakland signage can be found at http://www.oaklandbikes.info/Page122.aspx#wayfinding.
Flyer/Overview: www.oaklandbikes.info/AssetFactory.aspx?did=3759
Design Guidelines: www.oaklandbikes.info/AssetFactory.aspx?did=3672
Newsletter: http://www.oaklandbikes.info/Page126.aspx

A further question was raised about how to make fencing improvements on the eastern egress from the bridge. It was suggested that those concerns be sent to Ina Gerhard after review of the preliminary permit which can be found on the BCDC website: http://www.bcdc.ca.gov/

Item 3. Proposed Shoulder Rumble Strips on State Route 121 in Sonoma – Jonathon Dwyer, CT Office of Traffic Safety

Caltrans is proposing to add shoulder rumble strips (SRS) to two three-mile segments on SR 121 between the Sears Point Raceway and the Napa County line. Rather than space the yellow center lines 24" apart with 16" rumble strips applied between as has been done in the past, the treatment will be based on Districts 1 and 3 precedents whereby the yellow line will be painted over the rumble strip to save room and not impact existing lane width.

Almost all the shoulder area for this project is sub-standard. There is now new Federal nomenclature to define edge line (fog line) rumble strip (ELRS) treatment that Mr. Dwyer is proposing to adopt. He solicited comments and recommendations from the BAC on the following proposal:

- It is assumed that the bicyclist will travel in the traffic lane when the shoulder is less than 12" wide and therefore placing the rumble strip under the edge line is not diminishing the area that is usable to the bicyclists.
- In areas where there is a shoulder width of at least 2 feet, deemed usable by bicyclists, there will be no ELRS.
- Where the shoulder is 6' or over the ELRS will be applied, because the bicyclist can use the entire shoulder for travel.
- A 20' gap will be left between ELRS segments so that bicyclists can cross over the edgeline and get into the traffic lane when necessary.

BAC consensus was to recommend that no ELRS be added to any shoulder segment measuring less than 12'. The following comments were noted:

- From a bicyclist's perspective even the narrowest shoulder is better than nothing. If there is 12' or less don't waste space on ELRS.
- Shoulders less than 12" are perceived as area of safety and refuge, especially when traffic lane narrows or wide vehicles (semis and boats) pass. The option of a cyclist traveling in the lane to move to the right of the fog line is hindered if there is an ELRS that could make the difference between life and death.
- The ELRS would be an impediment when the cyclist needs to maneuver from the shoulder to the traffic lane if a situation (debris, etc.) demanded leftward movement.
- Any safety study should consider what the impacts will be on all modes. It can't be that a safety project is implemented for one mode while creating a hazard for another mode that is also entitled to use the facility.
- Consider shrinking lane width to (1) reduce vehicular speed while increasing shoulder width for bicyclists; (2) increase length of 20' non-ELRS gaps because a bicyclist traveling at 20 mph is not provided enough distance to negotiate the transition.

Item 4. Approval of October 21, 2009 Meeting Minutes
http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/transplanning/docs/d4_bac_mom_102109.pdf

The October 21, 2009 minutes were approved with the following correction:

- Robert Raburn attended a webinar concerning the MUTCD 2009 update and reported that freeway bicycle signage is being considered as an addition to the manual with experiments presently being conducted.
- The currently proposed white regulatory signage includes the bicycle symbol and reads "Bicycles May Use Full Lane".

Item 5. D4 BAC Structure, Operational Procedures, and Work Plan Development
http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/transplanning/docs/d4bac_charter_draft091013.pdf

The motion was made, seconded and approved to adopt the **Charter** with the following changes:

- **Goals and Objectives**, the second bullet point to read
  - Improve bicycle safety and access on **and across** Caltrans facilities.
- Acceptance of all underlined additions.

The Membership Committee will reconvene to consider any changes to the **Membership Criteria and Requirements** section with especial attention to voting privileges. The Committee will return with any proposals for amendments in April's meeting.

http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/transplanning/docs/d4bac_operational_procedures_draft091013.pdf

The following paragraph was added to the **Operational Procedures** to clarify that agenda items suggested by members of the public at large be channeled through the Executive Directors of the local coalitions:

Agenda items may be requested by any member of the public, or by any of the region's bicycle clubs and coalitions. In general, agenda items requested by one of the bicycle coalitions will be given priority, and the public and bicycle clubs are requested to work through their local coalition. To request an item be placed on an upcoming agenda, send a request to the bicycle coordinator or to the Chair. Appropriate agenda items are those that fall within the Committee's charter, and have regional significance or where attempts to resolve the problem locally have been unsuccessful.

The Committee will elect from among its members a Chair and Vice Chair to serve a bi-annual term. The Chair will facilitate the meetings using a simplified approach to Robert's Rules of Order. In the event of the Chair's absence from a meeting, the Vice Chair will facilitate.

http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/transplanning/docs/d4work_plan_draft091013.pdf

The Work Plan has been amended to read:

2. Review and provide input and feedback on projects involving centerline and shoulder rumble strips installation on rural highways.

Further Work Plan discussion issues to be presented at the April meeting:

- Is there a way to track Caltrans project mitigation requirements, especially maintenance issues? Would there be need for a separate matrix?
- Complete Streets updates provided whenever milestones are reached or input is required.
- Review and follow-up on status of Highway 4 with Hwy 4 Bypass Authority. The understanding to date is that the project may not have received ARRA funding because it has no NEPA clearance, nor is it shovel ready.

Item 6. Various Projects

1.) Skyline Drive (SR 35)/Skyridge Drive in Pacifica
A meeting will be set up between Caltrans, the City of Pacifica and SVBC within the next 2 weeks.

2.) Sharrows on El Camino Real in Millbrae
Work is being done on the specifications. The question is whether Caltrans Maintenance has the funding to install them.

Item 7. Future Agenda Items/Other Business/Announcements/Adjourn

D4 BAC meeting dates in 2010:

April 21
July 21
October 20