

**Final
Summary Notes
CALIFORNIA BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

August 1, 2013 10:00AM to 3:00PM
Veterans Affairs Building Room 513, 5th Floor
1227 O Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Members Present: (Includes teleconference attendees)

Alan Wachtel, CBAC Chair – California Association of Bicycling Organizations (CABO)
Jim Baross, CBAC Co-chair - San Diego County Bicycle Coalition
Sean Co – Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Daniel Klinker – California State Association of Counties (CSAC)
Michelle Mowery – League of California Cities/City of Los Angeles DOT
Dave Snyder California Bicycle Coalition (CBC)
Rye Baerg – Safe Routes to School National Partnership
Dave Kemp – City of Davis
James Muldavin – California Center of Civic Participation
Cindy Parra – Bike Bakersfield
Jennifer Rice – City of SLO
Alan Thompson – SCAG
Keith Williams – Shasta Living Streets
Corinne Winter – Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition
Kendra Bridges – California Department of Public Health

Members Absent:

Scott Loso - CHP

Others Present: (includes Teleconference attendees, but is not an exhaustive list):

Jennifer Dolan-Wyant – Alta Planning
Mary Burns, Acting Executive Secretary
Michelle DeRobertis – Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Robert Shanteau – Consulting Traffic Engineer
Ty Polastri – Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition
David Takemoto-Weerts – UC Davis, CABO District 3 Representative
Chris Ratekin – Caltrans Complete Streets
Beth Thomas – D04
Allan Crawford – City of Long Beach Coordinator
Bob Planthold – Chair California Walks Board of Directors
Katherine Hess – City of Davis Public Works
Brian Alconcel – Caltrans
John Cinatl – Retired Caltrans
Alan Forkosh – California Association of Bicycling Organizations
Emily Mraovich – Caltrans Planning
Roxann Namazi – City of Davis Public Works
Charles Nelson – Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition
Maggie O’Mara – Caltrans, Division of Design

Nicholas Don Paladino – Fresno Cycling Club
Matt Ramsey – California Highway Patrol
Chad Riding – Caltrans, District 3
Marie Schelling – California Highway Patrol
Dan Allison – Bicycle Advocate
Paul C Moore – BTA Program Manager, Caltrans
William Appleby – Yuba Area Bike Advocates
Ben Deal - Yuba Area Bike Advocates
Steve Bonrepos – StanCOG Bike/Ped Advisory Committee
Deborah Lynch – BTA Program Coordinator, Caltrans

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements

Paul Moore was introduced as the new Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) Program Manager. Paul will also be the Executive Secretary for CBAC.

2. Review and Approval of Previous, Meeting Notes

Reviewed and approved as corrected, the meeting minutes for April 4, 2013, and June 6, 2013.

3. District Reports – FYI

There were no district reports. There was discussion on whether or not to continue this section as there is seldom any updates from the districts.

4. Election of Officers, Alan Wachtel

The CBAC Members voted and approved unanimously for Michelle Mowery as CBAC Chair and for Jim Baross to continue as Co-chair.

5. Status Reports

a. The CBAC New Memberships Subcommittee; Alan Wachtel, Jim Baross, Michelle Mowery, Dave Snyder and Deborah Lynch announced the newly selected CBAC members. Please see attachment:



CBAC.Members.as.of.
July.22.2013.xlsx

b. The CBAC Members questioned whether the *Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act 2004* must be included in CBAC's Charter. The answer is yes, it must be included as it was a Deputy Directive in order to approve CBAC's Charter.

6. Unfinished Business / Follow Up Items from Prior Meetings

a. HDM Proposed Changes 2010-Median Bike Paths, Michelle Mowery & Maggie O'Mara: (See proposed changes in red)

(7) Bike Paths in the Median of Highway or Roadway. Bike paths *should* not be **placed** in the medians of State highways or roadways, *and shall should not be placed on* freeways or expressways. Bike paths in the median of highways are *generally* not recommended because they *may* require movements contrary to normal rules of the road. Specific problems with such facilities *may* include:

(a) Right-turns from the center of roadways for bicyclists are **unnatural atypical** and unexpected by motorists.*

(b) Devoting separate phases to bicyclist movements to and from a median path at signalized intersections.

(c) Left-turning motorists must cross one direction of motor vehicle traffic and two directions of bicycle traffic, which *may* increase conflicts.

(d) Where intersections are infrequent, bicyclists *may* enter or exit bike paths at midblock.

(e) Where medians are landscaped, visibility between bicyclists on the path and motorists at intersections are diminished. See Chapter 900 for planting guidance.

For the above reasons, bike paths in the median of highways should only be considered only when the above problems can be avoided. Bike paths shall not be designed in the medians of freeways or expressways.

Current HDM 2010 – Median Bike Paths:

(7) Bike Paths in the Median of Highway or Roadway. Bike paths **shall not should not** be placed in the medians of State highways or roadways, especially freeways or expressways. Bike paths in the median of highways are not recommended because they require movements contrary to normal rules of the road. Specific problems with such facilities include:

(a) Right-turns from the center of roadways for bicyclists are **unnatural atypical** and unexpected by motorists.

(b) Devoting separate phases to bicyclist movements to and from a median path at signalized intersections increases intersection delay.

(c) Left-turning motorists must cross one direction of motor vehicle traffic and two directions of bicycle traffic, which increases conflicts.

(d) Where intersections are infrequent, bicyclists will enter or exit bike paths at midblock.

(e) Where medians are landscaped, visibility between bicyclists on the path and motorists at intersections may be diminished. See Chapter 900 for planting guidance.

HDM 2006 – Median Bike Paths:

(6) Bike Paths in the Median of Highways. As a general rule, bike paths in the median of highways ~~are not recommended because they~~ require movements contrary to normal rules of the road. Specific problems with such facilities include:

(a) Bicyclist right turns from the center of roadways are unnatural for bicyclists and confusing to motorists.

(b) Proper bicyclist movements through intersections with signals are unclear.

(c) Left-turning motorists must cross one direction of motor vehicle traffic and two directions of bicycle traffic, which increases conflicts.

(d) Where intersections are infrequent, bicyclists will enter or exit bike paths at midblock.

(e) Where medians are landscaped, visual relationships between bicyclists and motorists at intersections are impaired. **(Sentence below added to end of 7(e))**

~~**For the above reasons, bike paths in the median of highways should only be considered only when the above problems can be avoided. Bike paths shall not be designed in the medians of freeways or expressways.**~~

Other comments by CBAC Members include:

Caltrans should not prohibit plans because they are difficult. Change all shalls to should to be more permissible. Engineers tend to avoid design exceptions because of the conflicts between non-motorists (bicyclists) and motorists. A guidance is needed in HDM for Median Bike Paths to include design exceptions such as width, entering, exiting, etc.

There was a motion by Michelle Mowery and 2nd motion by David Kemp to add CBAC's recommended changes to the 2010 HDM and submit them to Kevin Herritt in Caltrans Design Department. The CBAC Members voted approval unanimously.

- b. Update on S&HC 888 (non-freeway alternative routes) issues by Maggie O'Mara: There are major issues dealing with alternative routes on non-freeways with the local agencies, tribal lands, and the military. An operational and planning guidance is needed and then it must go to Caltrans management for closing policy. An action item for a subcommittee to present this to ATLC (Active Transportation Living Communities) and presented to the Director's meeting as being the ultimate goal.

7. New Business

- a. Photoluminescent and/or Retroreflective Products for bicycle and pedestrian safety, presented by Tyler Thompson and Louis Fuselier:

The Photoluminescent technology enables their products to absorb and store light energy from any light source, then in the dark, the energy is released as a bright glow. The products charge in as little as 15 seconds of direct sunlight or a maximum of 30 minutes from artificial light sources such as fluorescent light bulbs. Glow duration products are their brightest for the first two hours and still visible after 12 hours. Please see attached presentation:



Glowflective.DBI.Services.Presentation.pdf

If you would like additional information on these photoluminescent products contact Tyler Thompson, GlowFlective, at (909) 271-3412 or tthompson@glowflective.com Louis Fuselier, DBI Services, at (570) 459-1112 or lfuselier@dbiservices.com.

8. Legislative Update – Alan Wachtel

AB 417:

AMENDED IN SENATE JUNE 13,
2013

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 18,
2013

california legislature—2013–14 regular
session

ASSEMBLY BILL

No. 417

**Introduced by Assembly Member
Frazier**

February 15,
2013

An act to *amend Section 21080.20.5 of, and to add and repeal Section 21080.20 of, the Public Resources Code, relating to environmental quality.*

legislative counsel's digest

AB 417, as amended, Frazier. Environmental quality: California Environmental Quality Act: bicycle transportation plan.

The California Environmental Quality Act, known as CEQA, requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be

prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report, known as an EIR, on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA requires the lead agencies to make specified findings in an EIR.

Existing law authorizes a local agency that determines that a project is not subject to CEQA pursuant to certain exemptions and approves or determines to carry out that project, to file notice of the determination

with the county clerk in the county in which the project is located. *Existing law establishes the Office of Planning and Research, known as OPR, in the Governor's office. Existing law requires OPR to assist with, among other things, the orderly preparation of programs of transportation.*

This bill, until January 1, 2018, would exempt from CEQA a bicycle transportation plan for an urbanized area, as specified, and would also require a local agency that determines that the bicycle transportation plan is exempt under this provision and approves or determines to carry out that project, to file notice of the determination with the *OPR and the county clerk.*

Existing law exempts from CEQA a project that consists of the restriping of streets and highways for bicycle lanes in an urbanized area, as provided. Existing law requires a lead agency to, among other things, prepare an assessment of any traffic and safety impacts of the project and include measures in the project to mitigate potential vehicular traffic impacts and bicycle and pedestrian safety impacts.

This bill would prohibit the preparation of the assessment described above if certain conditions are met, including if measures to mitigate these impacts are identified in an environmental impact report, negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration, as provided.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: no.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 21080.20 is added to the Public Resources Code, to read:

21080.20. (a) This division does not apply to a bicycle transportation plan prepared pursuant to Section 891.2 of the Streets and Highways Code for an urbanized area for restriping of streets

and highways, bicycle parking and storage, signal timing to improve street and highway intersection operations, and related signage for bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles.

(b) Prior to determining that a project is exempt pursuant to this section, the lead agency shall do both of the following:

(1) Hold noticed public hearings in areas affected by the bicycle transportation plan to hear and respond to public comments. Publication of the notice shall be no fewer times than required by Section 6061 of the Government Code, by the public agency in a newspaper of general circulation in the area affected by the proposed project. If more than one area will be affected, the notice shall be published in the newspaper of largest circulation from among the newspapers of general circulation in those areas.

(2) ~~Include~~ *Prepare an assessment of any traffic and safety impacts of the project and include* measures in the bicycle transportation plan to mitigate potential vehicular traffic impacts and bicycle and pedestrian safety impacts.

(c) ~~Whenever~~ *If* a local agency determines that a project is not subject to this division pursuant to this section, and it determines to approve or carry out that project, the notice shall be filed with *the Office of Planning and Research* and the county clerk in the county in which the project is located in the manner specified in subdivisions (b) and (c) of Section 21152.

(d) This section shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2018, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2018, deletes or extends that date.

SEC. 2. Section 21080.20.5 of the Public Resources Code is amended to read:

21080.20.5. (a) This division does not apply to a project that consists of the restriping of streets and highways for bicycle lanes in an urbanized area that is consistent with a bicycle transportation plan prepared pursuant to Section 891.2 of the Streets and Highways Code.

(b) Prior to determining that a project is exempt pursuant to this section, the lead agency shall do both of the following:

(1) (A) Prepare an assessment of any traffic and safety impacts of the project and include measures in the project to mitigate potential vehicular traffic impacts and bicycle and pedestrian safety impacts.

(B) *The requirement to prepare an assessment pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall not apply if either of the following conditions is met:*

(i) *Measures to mitigate these impacts are identified in an environmental impact report, negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration prepared pursuant to this division for the bicycle transportation plan, certified or approved no more than five years prior to making the determination, the measures are included in the plan, and those measures are incorporated into the project.*

(ii) An assessment was prepared pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (b) of Section 21080.20 no more than five years prior to making the determination, the measures to mitigate these impacts are included in the plan, and those measures are incorporated into the project.

(2) Hold noticed public hearings in areas affected by the project to hear and respond to public comments. Publication of the notice shall be no fewer times than required by Section 6061 of the Government Code, by the public agency in a newspaper of general circulation in the area affected by the proposed project. If more than one area will be affected, the notice shall be published in the newspaper of largest circulation from among the newspapers of general circulation in those areas.

(c) (1) ~~Whenever~~ *If* a state agency determines that a project is not subject to this division pursuant to this section, and it determines to approve or carry out that project, the notice shall be filed with the Office of Planning and Research in the manner specified in subdivisions (b) and (c) of Section 21108.

(2) ~~Whenever~~ *If* a local agency determines that a project is not subject to this division pursuant to this section, and it determines to approve or carry out that project, the notice shall be filed with the Office of Planning and Research, and filed with the county clerk in the county in which the project is located in the manner specified in subdivisions (b) and (c) of Section 21152.

(d) This section shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2018, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2018, deletes or extends that date.

AB 1194:

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MAY 24, 2013
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 1, 2013
california legislature—2013–14 regular session

**Introduced by Assembly Members Ammiano and V. Manuel Pérez
(Coauthors: Assembly Members Alejo, Levine, and Pan)
February 22, 2013**

An act to amend Section 2333.5 of the Streets and Highways Code, relating to transportation.

legislative counsel's digest

AB 1194, as amended, Ammiano. Safe Routes to School Program.

Existing law creates the Safe Routes to School Program, administered by the Department of Transportation in consultation with the Department of the California Highway Patrol. Existing law requires the Department of Transportation to award grants to local government agencies based on the results of a statewide competition, under which proposals submitted for funding are

rated based on various factors. Existing law provides for the program to be funded from state and federal funds, as specified.

This bill would provide that the program may fund both construction and noninfrastructure activities, as specified. The bill would require the program to be funded by an annual appropriation in the budget act of not less than \$46,000,000, consisting of federal and state transportation funds eligible to be expended for this purpose. The bill would require 20% of program funds to be used for noninfrastructure activities, as specified. The bill would authorize the transfer of the responsibility for selecting projects and awarding grants from the Department of Transportation to the California Transportation Commission, at the discretion of the Transportation Agency. The bill would require the Department of Transportation to employ a full-time coordinator to administer the program. The bill would also delete references to a superseded federal transportation act.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: no.
The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 2333.5 of the Streets and Highways Code line 2 is amended to read:
3 2333.5. (a) The department, in consultation with the line 4 Department of the California Highway Patrol, shall establish and line 5 administer a “Safe Routes to School” program with the following line elements:

- (1) Construction of bicycle and pedestrian safety and traffic calming projects.
- (2) Noninfrastructure-related activities to encourage walking and bicycling to school, including public awareness campaigns and outreach to press and community leaders, traffic education and enforcement in the vicinity of schools, student sessions on bicycle and pedestrian safety, health, and environment, and funding for training, volunteers, and managers of safe routes to school programs.
- (b) The department shall award grants to local governmental agencies under the program based on the results of a statewide competition that requires submission of proposals for funding and rates those proposals on all of the following factors:
 - (1) Demonstrated needs of the applicant.
 - (2) Potential of the proposal for reducing child injuries and fatalities.
 - (3) Potential of the proposal for encouraging increased walking and bicycling among students.
 - (4) Identification of safety hazards.
 - (5) Identification of current and potential walking and bicycling routes to school.
 - (6) Use of a public participation process, including, but not limited to, a public meeting that satisfies all of the following:
 - (A) Involves the public, schools, parents, teachers, local agencies, the business community, key professionals, and others.
 - (B) Identifies community priorities and gathers community input to guide the development of projects included in the proposal.
 - (C) Ensures that community priorities are reflected in the proposal.
 - (D) Secures support for the proposal by relevant stakeholders.
 - (7) Benefit to a low-income school, defined for purposes of this section to mean a school where at least 75 percent of students are eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Program.

- (c) The program shall be funded by an annual appropriation in the Budget Act of not less than forty-six million dollars (\$46,000,000), consisting of federal and state transportation funds eligible to be expended for this purpose.
- (c) Any annual budget allocation to fund grants described in line subdivision (b) shall be in addition to any federal funding received line by the state that is designated for “Safe Routes to School” projects line pursuant to Section 1404 of SAFETEA-LU or any similar program line funded through a subsequent transportation act.*
- (d) Any federal funding received by the state that is designated for “Safe Routes to School” projects shall be distributed by the department under the competitive grant process, consistent with all applicable federal requirements.
- (e) Prior to the award of any construction grant or the department’s use of those funds for a “Safe Routes to School” construction project encompassing a freeway, state highway, or county road, the department shall consult with, and obtain approval from, the Department of the California Highway Patrol, ensuring that the “Safe Routes to School” proposal complements the California Highway Patrol’s Pedestrian Corridor Safety Program and is consistent with its statewide pedestrian safety statistical analysis.
- (f) The department is encouraged to coordinate with law enforcement agencies’ community policing efforts in establishing and maintaining the “Safe Routes to School” program.
- (g) In the development of guidelines and procedures governing this program, the department shall fully consider the needs of low-income schools
- (h) Up to 10 percent of program funds may be used to assist eligible recipients in making infrastructure improvements, other than schoolbus shelters, that create safe routes to schoolbus stops that are located outside the vicinity of schools.
- (i) At the discretion of the Transportation Agency, the responsibility for selecting projects and awarding grants under this section pursuant to the statewide competitive grant process may be transferred from the department to the commission.
- (j) Twenty percent of program funds shall be used for noninfrastructure-related activities as described in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a). Up to 20 percent of the funds use for noninfrastructure-related activities shall be used for a statewide technical assistance resource center.
- (k) The department shall employ a full-time safe routes to school coordinator to administer the Safe Routes to School program.

AB 1371:

AMENDED IN SENATE AUGUST 20, 2013
AMENDED IN SENATE JUNE 26, 2013
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 24, 2013
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 8, 2013
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MARCH 21, 2013
california legislature—2013–14 regular session
ASSEMBLY BILL No. 1371

Introduced by Assembly Member Bradford
February 22, 2013

An act to amend *amend, repeal, and add* Section 21750 of, and to add Section 21750.1 21760 to, the Vehicle Code, relating to vehicles.

legislative counsel's digest

AB 1371, as amended, Bradford. Vehicles: bicycles: passing distance.

Under existing law, a driver of a vehicle overtaking another vehicle or a bicycle proceeding in the same direction is required to pass to the left at a safe distance without interfering with the safe operation of the overtaken vehicle or bicycle, subject to certain limitations and exceptions. A violation of this provision is an infraction punishable by a fine not exceeding \$100 for a first conviction, and up to a \$250 fine for a 3rd and subsequent conviction occurring within one year of 2 or more prior infractions.

This bill would enact the Three Feet for Safety Act, which would require the driver of a motor vehicle overtaking and passing a bicycle that is proceeding in the same direction on a highway to pass in compliance with specified requirements applicable to overtaking and passing a vehicle, and to do so at a safe distance that does not interfere with the safe operation of the overtaken bicycle, having due regard for the size and speed of the motor vehicle and the bicycle, traffic conditions, weather, and the surface and width of the highway. The bill would prohibit, with specified exceptions, the driver of the motor vehicle that is overtaking or passing a bicycle proceeding in the same direction on a highway from passing at a distance of less than 3 feet between any part of the motor vehicle and any part of the bicycle or its operator. The bill would make a violation of these provisions an infraction punishable by a \$35 fine. The bill would also require the imposition of a \$220 fine on a driver if a collision occurs between a motor vehicle and a bicyclist causing bodily harm to the bicyclist, and the driver is found to be in violation of the above provisions. *This bill would make these provisions operative on September 16, 2014.* Because this bill would create a new crime, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that no reimbursement is required by this act for a specified reason.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: yes.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 21750 of the Vehicle Code is amended line 2 to read:

3 21750. (a) The driver of a vehicle overtaking another vehicle, vehicle, *vehicle or bicycle*, subject to the limitations and line 7 exceptions set forth in this article.

(b) *This section shall become inoperative on September 16, line 9 2014, and, as of January 1, 2015, is repealed, unless a later line 10 enacted statute, that becomes operative on or before January 1, line 11 2015, deletes or extends the dates on which it becomes inoperative line 12 and is repealed.*

Section 21750 is added to the Vehicle Code, to read

(a) *The driver of a vehicle overtaking another vehicle line 2 proceeding in the same direction shall pass to the left at a safe line 3 distance without interfering with the safe operation of the overtaken line 4 vehicle, subject to the limitations and exceptions set forth in this line 5 article. This section shall become operative on September 16, 2014.*

Section 21750.1 21760 is added to the Vehicle Code, line 9 to read:

- (a) This section shall be known and may be cited as line the Three Feet for Safety Act.
- (b) The driver of a motor vehicle overtaking and passing a bicycle that is proceeding in the same direction on a highway shall pass in compliance with the provisions *requirements* of this article applicable to overtaking and passing a vehicle, and shall do so at a safe distance that does not interfere with the safe operation of the overtaken bicycle, having due regard for the size and speed of the motor vehicle and the bicycle, traffic conditions, weather, visibility, and the surface and width of the highway.
- (c) A driver of a motor vehicle shall not overtake or pass a bicycle proceeding in the same direction on a highway at a distance of less than three feet between any part of the motor vehicle and any part of the bicycle or its operator.
- (d) If the driver of a motor vehicle is unable to comply with subdivision (c), due to traffic or roadway conditions, the driver shall slow to a speed that is reasonable and prudent, and may pass only when doing so would not endanger the safety of the operator of the bicycle, taking into account the size and speed of the motor vehicle and bicycle, traffic conditions, weather, visibility, and surface and width of the highway.
- (e) (1) A violation of subdivision (b), (c), or (d) is an infraction punishable by a fine of thirty-five dollars (\$35).
- (2) If a collision occurs between a motor vehicle and a bicycle causing bodily injury to the operator of the bicycle, and the driver of the motor vehicle is found to be in violation of subdivision (b), (c), or (d), a two-hundred-twenty-dollar (\$220) fine shall be imposed on that driver.
- (f) *This section shall become operative on September 16, 2014.*

SEC. 3. No reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to line 3 Section 6 of Article XIIB of the California Constitution because the only costs that may be incurred by a local agency or school district will be incurred because this act creates a new crime or infraction, eliminates a crime or infraction, or changes the penalty for a crime or infraction, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code, or changes the definition of a crime within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution.

Note: The Legislature has been off the last month and will reconvene on August 5, 2013.

9. Topics for Next Meeting / Additional Items / Adjourn

- a. Invite Devinder Singh from CTCDC (California Traffic Control Devices Committee) to the October meeting to discuss experimental projects and CBAC's review involvement
- b. Overview of "Understanding Bicycle Transportation" training provided to Caltrans/local agency staff and other stakeholders by Dan Gutierrez
- c. Dan Klinker will do a presentation on "Buffered Bike Lanes".

Next Meeting October 3, 2013, Department of Transportation, 1227 O Street, Veterans Affairs Building Room 513, Sacramento, CA (), 10AM to 3PM.