

# **Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Advisory Committee (D4 BAC)**

## **Meeting Summary**

**May 15, 2013**

**1:30 PM – 3:30 PM**

**111 Grand Ave, Oakland, Room 240, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor**

### **Members Present (including teleconference attendees):**

Eric Anderson, City of Berkeley

Andrew Boone, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (San Mateo County)

Alan Forkosh, Alameda County resident

Paul Goldstein, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (Santa Clara County)

Rick Marshall, Napa County Public Works Department, D4 BAC Vice Chair

Carol Levine, Oakland Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Bruce “Ole” Ohlson, East Bay Bicycle Coalition (Contra Costa County), Delta Pedalers

Alisha Oloughlin, Marin County Bicycle Coalition

Rochelle Wheeler, Alameda County Transportation Commission

Corinne Winter, Bay Area Bicycle Coalition

### **Non-Members Present (including teleconference attendees):**

Ken Chin, City of San Mateo staff

Dan Dawson, Marin County Public Works

Michelle DeRobertis, Alameda County resident, former District 4 BAC member

Casey Hildreth, Alta Planning and Design

John Langbein, San Mateo County resident

## **1. Welcome and Introductions**

## **2. Orders of the Day**

No changes were made to the agenda.

## **3. Review and Approval of Summary of January 2013 Meeting**

The summary was approved with one edit, which is the addition of a sentence stating that the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities (2012 edition) provides guidance stating that the aggregate used for chip seal should be no more than 3/8 inch in size.

#### **4. Overview of Results of Site Visit at Chip Seal Project on SR 35 (Skyline Rd) – Ramses Sargiss, District 4 Maintenance and Toll Bridge Engineering Chief and Vijith Thilakaratne, District 4 Senior Maintenance Engineer**

This was a follow-up to the item on the same topic on the agenda for the January 2013 meeting. Ramses explained that ½” aggregate was used over the 23-mile stretch of the project. He described the condition of the project and said that Maintenance had agreed to fill the digouts, add shoulder backing, and do more sweeping. He also said that District 4 would not be using ½” aggregate for chip seal projects anymore.

A discussion followed. Paul asked about the chip seal study that District 5 is having UC Davis conduct. Ramses replied that they are doing strip tests of different sizes of aggregate on SR 198. Corinne said that she had spoken with Nita Logan, District 4 North Design Division Chief, about duplicating the District 5 study on SR 35. John stated that he did not think that SR 198 is comparable to SR 35 because SR 35 has more fall cooling and shade compared to SR 198. He further stated that he and Corinne had discussed asking that District 4 re-roll the roadway edge and shoulder of SR 35. Paul added that the County had repaved Old La Honda Road with 5/16” aggregate chip seal, which had no problems.

#### **5. Discussion and Comment on Shoulder and Center Line Rumble Strip Placement – Warwick Cheung and Mimy Hew, Senior Engineers in the District 4 Office of Advance Planning, and Roland Au-Yeung, District 4 Traffic Safety Office Chief**

Roland presented to the BAC proposed District guidance for placement of shoulder and center line rumble strips based on existing shoulder and lane widths. Beth explained that the impetus for proposing this guidance is that District 4 is developing projects for center line rumble strips on SR 1 in Marin County and shoulder and center line rumble strips for SR 1 in Sonoma County.

A discussion followed among the members about riding position and preferences regarding rumble strip use and placement. Michelle stated that she thought that shoulder rumble strips should not be used at all. Paul stated that rumble strips are particularly useful on roads where a motorist is likely to fall asleep, but that most cyclists prefer to ride within 2 feet to the right of the shoulder line. He added that the depth of the rumble strips and whether they are beveled matter. Alan stated that, on curvy roads, rumble strips do not help because there is not much recovery time, but that they make sense on Highway 1 in Santa Cruz where people need to pay attention.

Andrew asked whether the safety effect of rumble strips on bicyclists had been studied. Roland replied that the 1999 study did not look at crashes. John offered to email the study to Beth to distribute to the BAC members. He said that Caltrans did the study, which tested types of rumble strips.

Roland said that he would revise the proposed rumble strip guidance and send it out to the members by way of Beth.

Members were asked to send specific comments on rumble strips to Beth Thomas, the District 4 Bicycle Advisory Committee liaison.

## **6. Discussion of Caltrans “Understanding Bicycle Transportation” Training**

The members reviewed some of the slides from this course that was provided by Caltrans Headquarters in District 4 in November 2012. Eric, who had attended the course, stated that he would like for Caltrans to provide another training course in District 4 with a bicycle facility designer as the instructor. Alisha, who had also attended the course in November, stated that she agreed that the course should have been more balanced. Rochelle said that it is a concern since there is a high demand for this type of training. The BAC members voted to draft a letter to Caltrans Headquarters about their concerns regarding the training and requesting revisions to the course. The motion passed.

## **7. Review of District 4 BAC Charter**

This item was postponed until the following meeting due to a lack of time.

## **8. Updates on Policies/Guidance/Issues Previously Presented**

Beth went over the response to District 4 BAC comments on the 2012 California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices that she had received from Caltrans Headquarters, but stated that she needed to get the complete set of District 4 BAC comments so that she could check whether responses were received for all of the comments.

Beth also gave an update on the status of implementation of Assembly Bill 819. She said that Caltrans Headquarters Division of Design was still working on assembling the external committee for review of bikeway geometric design experimentation proposals.

Michelle described the recent California Bicycle Advisory Committee (CBAC) discussion related to the California Highway Design Manual (HDM). She said that, as of the May 2012 HDM revisions, Table 1003.1, which gives guidance on surface quality, had been deleted and the guidance on median bike paths had become more restrictive. She said that either the language should be changed back to what it was or revisions should be made to make the guidance less restrictive. She indicated that others interested in the topic should participate in the June CBAC meeting where it would be revisited.

## **9. Public Comments**

No public comments were received.

## **10. Topics for Next Meeting, Announcements and Information Sharing**

A few items were suggested for placement on the agenda for the next meeting. Paul asked that the District 4 BAC Charter be reviewed. Andrew asked that bike path maintenance be placed on the agenda. Alisha requested a discussion of how to get bike path crashes recorded statewide.

Beth responded that the California Strategic Highway Safety Plan Challenge Area 13 (Bicycling) and Challenge Area 8 (Pedestrian) Committees would be a more effective venue for addressing that concern. She added that the Challenge Area 8 Committee is already working on an action item draft to improve pedestrian crash reporting and is interested in working with the Challenge Area 13 Committee on this.