Caltrans District-4 Bicycle Advisory Committee

Minutes
October 21, 2009 1:30 – 3:30
District 4 Headquarters, Mountain View Room, 15th Floor,
111 Grand Avenue, Oakland

Attendance:
Ina Gerhard Caltrans D4 Bicycle Coordinator
Robert Raburn EBBC
Bob Eltgroth CABO (via telephone)
Alan Forkosh CABO (via telephone)
Robert Cronin SVBC
Paul Goldstein SVBC
Carlos Babcock SVBC
David Hoffman MCBC
Pat Giorni Bicyclist, San Mateo County
Beth Thomas Caltrans, D4 Community Planning and Pedestrian Coordination, Branch Chief
Aprile Smith Caltrans, D4 Community Planning and Pedestrian Coordination

Item 1. Welcome and introductions were made.

Item 2. Staff Report

- Bicycle Transportation Account Applications for projects are due at Caltrans Headquarters on December 1. The website link is http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/bta/btawebPage.htm The BTA holds $7.2M for the entire State.

- Proposed Bicycles in Work Zone Guidance will be added to the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) in January 2010. Ina provided typical applications prepared by Johnny Bhullar, Headquarters Traffic Operations Branch Chief, that will be added to Chapter 6H of the MUTCD demonstrating how to provide bicycle accommodation in work zones. A presentation was given to CBAC two weeks ago in Sacramento. Comments should be submitted as early as possible before the January meeting directly to: Johnny_bhullar@dot.ca.gov .http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/transplanning/docs/prop_bikes_work_zones_guidancemutcd091013.pdf
    - Paul Goldstein noted that the red construction warning signs in construction zones that read "Share the Road" should be changed to read "Watch for Bicyclists" to avoid any misinterpretation by motorists. He also suggested that standard W11-1 signage reading "Watch for Bicyclists" be added to State routes and freeway segments that allow bicycle usage.
    - 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".

- West Span of the SF-Oakland Bay Bridge update: T Y Lynn has been awarded a $1.3M contract to prepare a Project Initiation Document (PID) that is scheduled to be completed by April 2011. A design charette will be held in December with no date determined as of this meeting. Caltrans Office of Advance Planning is providing PID oversight. Robert Blanco is the lead.

Item 3. Review and approval of the Minutes of July 15, 2009

The minutes were approved with no changes.

Item 4. Report on Action Items from April 15, 2009 Meeting

- Centerline Rumble Strips (CLRS) on State Route 9 – Site Visit and Survey
  http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/transplanning/docs/sr9site_visit_feedback091013.pdf
  Caltrans set up a speed survey for SR 9 in Santa Clara County and proposes to reduce the 35mph speed limit to 30mph. There is also an application currently being reviewed at Headquarters requesting $3.5M from Safety SHOPP to improve safety in 61 locations along the 7 mile stretch between Saratoga and Highway 35 primarily for shoulder widening. Ina said the application has a good chance of approval because it is based on the high number of accidents.
    - A shoulder widening project for Niles Canyon – SR 84 in Alameda - is in the PID phase and scheduled for construction in 2011. It was suggested that a site visit from Sunol to SR 680, outside the project scope, be initiated since SR 84 has been extended to give bicyclists access into the Livermore Valley and there remains a 1- mile pinch point. Although a safety project is being considered, at this juncture it is not known if anything other than signage might be considered.
    - A shoulder and centerline rumble strip project request has been submitted for a section of SON-121 west of the Napa/Sonoma county line.
    - Report on Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition informal Rumble Strip Survey from Paul Goldstein: No solid conclusions could be drawn from the survey. There were 84 responses from Peninsula cyclists. 41 respondents felt less safe on roads with rumble strips; 13 felt safer; 25 felt there was no difference. The vast majority of respondents said that rumble strips would make no difference in their decision to continue cycling on Hwy 9; 19% said they would be less likely; 6 (%?) said it made no difference. The majority feeling was that cyclists felt more comfortable in situations where placement of the rumble strip was ground into the existing center line rather than places where the median was widened to accommodate a rumble strip, thus decreasing lane width. Robert Raburn made note that the BAC membership "ask" that whenever a CLRS is to be added to a road then there must be shoulder widening because the two strategies go "hand in hand." With CLRS deployment without shoulder widening a domino effect is created which leaves the cyclist at greater risk.

- D4 BAC Structure and Operational Procedures: All changes proposed at the last meeting have been incorporated into the document. A decision to adopt the documents has been postponed until the January, 2010 meeting due to the absence of Michelle DeRobertis (VTA) and Sean Co (MTC). There was discussion regarding the composition of membership to ensure geographic equality of the 9 Bay Area counties to include the participation of regional and local bicycle coalitions. Later discussion involving membership noted that as the regional funding agency, MTC, should continue to provide a representative, along with an alternate to avoid absences, to work with the D4 BAC in order to lend more gravitas to the BAC. David Hoffman will contact CBC members to explore the structure of other District BACs. Ina will follow up with Ken McGuire and other Caltrans districts in order to determine if there might be other alternatives that we could utilized in our Structure or Operating Procedures. Discussion moved to determine what would constitute an agenda item. Noting the distinction between High Level Policy and Practice, i.e., CLRS, versus Individual Facilities Policy/Practices/Problems, i.e., multi-path maintenance, traffic signal timing, it was decided that in the event that a CMA or other local agency can not reach a solution to an issue at the District level, then it should be submitted to Ina for investigation and agenda inclusion if warranted. It was suggested that the BAC membership might contribute brief reports from their areas of representation about progress on specific local issues.
  http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/transplanning/docs/d4bac_charter_draft091013.pdf
  http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/transplanning/docs/d4bac_operational_procedures_draft091013.pdf

- Work Plan Development: There was no discussion of this item with the timed arrival of Beth Thomas to present Item 5.
  http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/transplanning/docs/d4work_plan_draft091013.pdf

Item 5. PM Grand Boulevard Initiative

Beth Thomas, CT Community Planning Branch Chief and Liaison to the Grand Boulevard Initiative, a partnership of Samtrans, San Mateo County Transportation Authority, Santa Clara VTA, and 19 cities along the Peninsula. Samtrans is the recipient of a Caltrans grant to develop a multi-modal transportation corridor plan for El Camino Real (SR 82) from Daly City to the San Jose City line. Currently, prototypes for roadway cross-section samples are developed and approved by Caltrans as examples of what the cities could design. Although they may require some design exceptions, they are fairly typical exceptions which should likely gain approval. The prototypes were reviewed and comments were made. One outstanding design prototype (#8) included European elements when parking is removed. It was recommended to reference the Dutch CROW Facilities Manual which can be accessed at www.bicyclingconcepts.com . It includes all The Netherlands research. Since written comments need to be made before publication of these minutes, it was recommended that the designers keep in mind that the Grand Boulevard Initiative needs to comply with the Complete Streets Act and provide safe space for bicyclists.

Item 6. Various Projects

- Sharrows on El Camino Real in Millbrae: Caltrans Traffic Safety has agreed to install sharrows on the El Camino Real for approximately 1 mile between Linden Avenue and Center Street and is advancing the paperwork. It was noted that the sharrow is an

effective tool but it should not be used in place of providing adequate room for the bicyclist. It was also recommended that sharrows not be used on the west side frontage road which contains diagonal parking, but that cyclists in that case should rather use the outermost travel lane on El Camino Real.

- Groove shoulder @ Hwy 37/US 101 in Marin: A request to install shoulder rumble strips at the South Novato on-ramp merge to US101 southbound will be part of the scope of the Marin-Sonoma Narrows project with construction scheduled to begin in Summer 2010. In the meantime Caltrans will install Bicycle warning signage. The rumble strips have been deemed necessary for as long as this section remains a bike route. A separate bike facility will be constructed as part of the 70-mile SMART Corridor project between Larkspur and Cloverdale.
- Burlingame ped O/C at Broadway/US 101: The issues have been solved and there is no need to update or bring back to a future agenda.
- Skyline Drive (SR 35)/Skyridge Drive in Pacifica; Caltrans Traffic Safety is proposing to remove the 2nd and 3rd pole to allow cyclists to cross the intersection on the shoulder through the remaining poles and continue along the shoulder past the barrier. The BAC found this to be an unacceptable solution. It was decided to move this along by starting a formal review process whereby BABC and SVBC will send simultaneous letters to District 4 and the City of Pacifica outlining the problem and requesting review and a solution to regaining the former safety factor that has now been lost to cyclists. If no acceptable solution is reached the groundwork will be in place to request a Facilities Denied Review at the State level.

Item 7. Other Business/Announcements/Adjourn

None. The meeting adjourned at 3:30pm

D4BAC meeting dates in 2010:

January 20
April 21
July 21
October 20