

FINAL
Summary Notes
CALIFORNIA BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

June 6, 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 - San Diego County Bicycle Coalition
Sean Co – Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Daniel Klinker – California State Association of Counties (CSAC)
Scott Loso – CHP
Michelle Mowery – League of California Cities/City of Los Angeles DOT
Dave Snyder – California Bicycle Coalition (CBC)

Members Absent:

Kendra Bridges – California Department of Public Health

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
Alan Thompson – SCAG
Ty Polastri – Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition
David Takemoto-Weerts – UC Davis, CABO District 3 Representative
Chris Ratekin – Caltrans Complete Streets
Dale Benson – D07
Beth Thomas – D04
Allan Crawford – City of Long Beach Coordinator
Bob Planthold – Chair California Walks Board of Directors
David Kemp – City of Davis, Active Transportation Coordinator
Katherine Hess – City of Davis Public Works
Brian Alconcel – Caltrans Division of Traffic Operations
John Cinatl – Retired Caltrans
Alan Forkosh – CABO
Emily Mraovich – Caltrans Division of 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
Kevin Pokrajac – Caltrans Division of Local Assistance
Matt Ramsey – CHP
Chad Riding – Caltrans, District 3
Marie Schelling – CHP

Cindy Parra – Bike Bakersfield
Dan Allison – Bicycle Advocate

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements

Alan Wachtel announced they did not have a quorum for conducting business requiring a vote.

Mary Burns was Acting Executive Secretary in place of Deborah Lynch.

Alan Wachtel will remain CBAC Chairman as there were no objections.

2. Review and Approval of Previous, Meeting Notes

The April 4th and June 6th CBAC meeting minutes will be reviewed, critiqued, and approved once corrections are made at the next meeting on August 1st.

3. District Reports – FYI

District 6, Fresno, Pedro Ramirez, BTA Coordinator:

On May 8th, over 100 bicyclists participated in the Fresno Mall-to-Mall ride. From the central Manchester Mall to the downtown Fulton Mall, police escorted riders and blocked traffic at the intersections. Coffee and pastries were enjoyed at the end of the ride. It was also an effective way of networking with the biking community.

May 15, different agencies and groups competed in the Bike to Work Corporate Challenge. The team categories ranged from solo to the large team. Caltrans District 6 for the fifth year in a row won the large team category with 69 riders accumulating 1411 miles.

On May 18, the California Classic Bicycle Race was on the freeway section of State Route 168 from Fresno to Clovis for part of the course. Over 8 miles of freeway was closed off for bicyclist competing in the race.

May 21st, Pedro attended a meeting with the CHP to discuss grant funding for bicycle safety. The CHP along with local police concluded how grant funds will be used to educate the public on bicycle and pedestrian safety.

4. New Business

A. Bike Corrals on State Highways, Coronado, Jim Baross

Summarization:

Jim Baross met April 16th with District 11 staff, Seth Cutter and Troy Bucko. It seems there is no HDM, MUTCD or other state guidance that prohibits or recommends against installation of Bicycle Corrals on a section of Orange St/SR 75 in the city of Coronado, CA. There are also apparently no official guiding principles or standards already in the applicable state documents for on-street bicycle parking-Corrals.

It was recommended at CBAC that proposals for such guidance be developed by a subcommittee of the CBAC, initially identified as: Michelle Mowery, Michelle DeRobertis, Maggie O'Mara, Brian Alconcel and Jim Baross, subsequently also with assistance from Seth Cutter, Dave Johnson, Bryan Jones, and Troy Bucko (Thank you).

Jim Baross listed below some of the concerns and criteria already suggested for such guidance. (Jim was also wondering if trying out new guidance/standards that would be proposed for the HDM would require getting permission and hopefully authorization for experimental installations. Maybe appropriate implementation of AB 819 could be bump-started?)

Maggie: I don't see why experimentation would be required, although it might be desirable from the perspective of determining the optimal designs for barricades or other perimeter control that prevents parked vehicles from encroaching into the corral without impeding bicyclist access or maintenance.

Concerns that I have heard so far and some proposed responses, in no special order include:

1) Should there be Standards or Guidelines? Maggie: I think there should just be guidelines at this point since it's an evolving concept.

a. Develop guidelines and recommendations rather than standards. Per Main Streets: Flexibility in Design & Operations, <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/context/main-streets-flexibility-in-design.pdf>

2) Is there a reason to apply more criteria to bike parking than are applied to on-street motor vehicle parking? Where on-street vehicle parking is allowed, what additional guidelines are applicable for Corrals, if any?

Maggie: I don't see any justification for any criteria from the perspective of passing traffic other than that any objects that comprise the Corral (bike racks, bollards, signs) should be as yielding as a full-size SUV if moving traffic crashes into it. Any barriers or curbs at the ends of the Corral to prevent encroachment by parked vehicles should not be more of a crash hazard to bicycle traffic than a parked full size SUV. It might make sense to require any barriers placed at any part of the perimeter have a 2' offset from a bike or traffic lane, just as we require fixed objects to be at least 2' from the paved edge of a bike path.

a. Research and clarify whether bicycles are allowed to park in spaces the vehicle code (CVC) designates/allows for vehicle parking. CVC 463, 22508, 22502, 22510.

Maggie: Once a local agency decides to change the spot from designation as vehicle parking to bike parking, do the CVC codes on vehicle parking apply? I wouldn't think so.

- b. Vehicle parking can be required to be removed clearing the space for other uses and/or roadway maintenance; Corrals' guidance should include consideration for a Corral's temporary removal for such purposes.

Maggie: I doubt that it would be practical to remove Bike Corral Racks and other objects for maintenance. The local agency needs to use a design that facilitates maintenance. I don't know what "other uses" might require parking removal.

- 3) Is a parking lane an area clear of obstructions available for recovery of errant vehicles; a crash recovery zone?

Maggie O'Mara: Clearly, it is not. The term, by the way, is "clear recovery zone," and the definition in both Caltrans and FHWA guidance makes it clear that a lane that is available for vehicle parking is not available for motorists to use it as a clear recovery zone. That's probably why, in any definition or standards for clear recovery zone, you won't find a discussion of parking in a Crash Recovery one (CRZ)...

CRZ recommendations for conventional highways are not applicable when the speed limit is less than or equal to 40 mph. Similarly, if parking spaces are considered to be in the traveled way.

Maggie: parking spaces are not in the traveled way. See "traveled way" definition in HDM.

Should a prohibition of "fixed objects" in a crash recovery zone and/or on roads with speed limits set above 40mph apply to Corrals?

Maggie: On street parking is not a clear recovery zone. If so, should the recommendation for Corral type include non-fixed-base corrals with break-away/"slip-base connection?

Maggie: No. Parking lanes are not CRZs.

- a. Is there need to clarify CVC that may or may not define a parked vehicle as a fixed object.

Maggie: Not necessary, because a parking lane is not a CRZ. It is not available for redirecting errant vehicles when used as designed (for parking).

- b. May require development of consensus on definition of "fixed objects" and horizontal clearances among Caltrans' Traffic Ops, Legal and Design sections.

Maggie: A designated parking zone is not a CRZ, so corral fixtures that are as forgiving as a parked full size SUV should require no more clearance from moving traffic than is required for vehicle parking.

4) Should there be recommendations for placement distance away from intersections, driveways, etc. especially since removing on-street parking of vehicles at an intersection, replaced by bike Corrals, would likely improve sight-l

a. No (?) Maggie: Corral fixtures and bikes parked in them should provide as much corner sight distance as would exist if a panel van is parked in the same space, assuming that the space is available for vehicle parking under the owner agency's standards/ordinances.

5) What conditions would lead to recommendations against a Corral that differ from those for vehicle parking? Posted and actual vehicle speeds? Average daily "traffic"/number of motor vehicles and/or bicycles? Horizontal clearances and space for access to/from the adjacent travel lane such as a so-called "landing area" and/or re-entry to the street? Visibility from road and sidewalks and at night? Appropriate signage - informational, appropriate parking rules - time limits, how to park/lock a bike, etc.? Inappropriate signage - advertisements, colors, lighting.

a. None (?) Maggie: Other than enough visibility/signing to make it clear to approaching motorists that the Corral is not a vacant vehicle parking space, and making any corral fixtures as forgiving and clear of moving traffic as a parked full size SUV would be, I see no reason to apply criteria such as traffic speeds to bike Corrals that is not applied to vehicle parking. Informational signs may be needed if there's an unusual rack design, to help bicyclists use the racks properly.

6) What Corral design specification recommendations might be appropriate: length, width, height, distance from curb: material type, color, and design. Noting that parked vehicle design, type, etc. is not normally specified with some exceptions for commercial, passenger drop off, etc.

Maggie: Only need recommendations that address access for users, maintainability, preventing motorists from thinking it's a parking space, preventing encroachment from parked vehicles, use by longer bicycle configurations, visibility of corral fixtures to moving bicyclists who may be unwisely riding too far to the right, and providing the same clearance to any Corral fixtures as provided to the widest vehicle (vehicle width 8.5' excluding mirrors) that may legally park in an on-street parking space.

a. Orientation of parking "stalls"/racks should provide space for user access.

Maggie: Yes especially for longer and wider bike configurations such as bikes with cargo holding devices and bikes pulling trailers or trail-a-bikes.

- b. Engineering staff may exercise engineering judgments; per HDM Topic 309.1 (1) "The horizontal clearance to all roadside objects should be based on engineering judgment with the objective of maximizing the distance between roadside objects and the edge of traveled way. Engineering judgment should be exercised in order to balance the achievement of horizontal clearance objectives and reduction of maintenance cost and exposure to workers, with the prudent expenditure of available funds.

Maggie: Criteria more restrictive than that applied to vehicle parking would be hard to justify.

7) Who is responsible for maintenance - for repair/replacement, street-cleaning and trash clean up, graffiti removal, responsibility for dealing with clearly abandoned bikes/equipment, temporary removal for special events, etc.

- a. Ownership and maintenance responsibility should be clearly assigned.

Maggie: clearly, the local agency that maintains the vehicle parking should be ultimately responsible for maintaining the bike parking area. What kind of special event would justify removal of bike parking?

8) Research and clarify, as needed, CVC regarding whether a bicycle or bicycles may park lawfully in a vehicle parking space; metered or not, Corral and/or marked stalls or not, etc.

- a. Research and determine that CVC 22502, Curb Parking applicable to vehicles is not applicable to bicycles; specifically (1) "right-hand wheels of the vehicle parallel and within 18 inches of the right-hand curb... motorcycle parked with at least one wheel or fender touching the right-hand curb" and "... does not permit a vehicle to stop or park upon a roadway in a direction opposite to that in which traffic normally moves..."

Maggie: as I noted earlier, if the local agency doesn't designate the Corral for vehicle parking, this section does not apply.

- b. Research and determine applicability to bicycles of CVC 463, "Park or parking shall mean the standing of a vehicle..." and perhaps 22508 Parking Meter Zones.

Maggie: Does not apply to bike parking. File under things that "by their very nature" don't apply to bikes.

4. New Business

- b. S&HC 888 – Non-freeway Alternative Route Issues, Maggie O'Mara

In the past provision of 888 tells Caltrans we cannot build a freeway that cuts off access unless alternatives are provided. Some alternatives are under control of agencies other than Caltrans. (federal, local, tribal lands) intent of 888 has not been met when restrictions are met on time of use. Non-motorized is interrupted.

Offer to investigate alternative ways so that we abide by 888. CBAC endorsed inter-agency agreements. Agreements are only used during construction phases of projects.

Maggie spoke with attendees at a meeting and it was suggested they should obtain an encroachment permit or easement on private or public property/way until another non-motorized alternative was/is provided. After time, knowledge of the easement may decrease and eventually not exist. Caltrans should gain control of these ways and maintain them. Caltrans should be responsible for these facilities so that future owners have to answer to us and not LAs. 3 options – not impede the access (across) – allow cyclists use on freeways. Some access already exists (but may not be in control of Caltrans). Provided as part of the Freeway project, i.e., building a frontage road. Problems are more paths than roads according to past CBAC concerns.

Access roads may not provide full access bicyclist stops.

Existing streets and roads as an alternate to the freeway. Who determines what is reasonable?

Chapter 31 of Caltrans Project Development Procedures Manual – see Alan for manual. Propose additional language to clarify more standards/guidelines.

Situation in Bakersfield 99 interchange – current bike access 8 ft shoulder. Curbs installed and decreasing shoulder. City doesn't want cyclists on Rosedale. Is this where we could have an easement or encroachment to force them to provide access for cyclists? They aren't currently going to provide bike facility. Their excuse is businesses and driveways.

It is up to the agency. Cyclists' safety purposes? Local communities need to express to the city/agency, - Maggie and Cindy will talk later since it's a State Right-of-Way and a different issue.

Caltrans needs something in writing with LA, federal, private, etc. or directly acquire (purchase, easement, encroachment) control of all alternate routes. When we build a new freeway we need to build facilities to maintain continuity of access.

Control of the alternate routes through purchase seems unrealistic. Easements or encroachment may be more feasible. If Caltrans constructs a freeway but identifies alternate routes already exist – local road is temporarily interrupted – how will Caltrans exercise responsibility to make local the road open. Find all freeways subject to S&H 888 and execute agreements with respect to local roads.

Maggie, “Alternate routes should be discussed before design. Add to Chap 31 in PPM? Committee should look at Chap 31 and craft a vision for a plan to abide by S&H 888, with possible pitfalls. “

Dan Allison, “1st step is to send a letter to Caltrans about 888 not being met, what are we going to do about it? How will they change?”

Maggie suggested, “You can communicate with the Caltrans, Active Living Communities (ATLC), and director, name the code in violation and give presentation to ATLC with photos, description of problems. Contact the districts for records.”

Michelle Mowery, “table the item and ask Districts and Bike coordinators which roads have access problems and ask how Caltrans plans to comply with S&H 888.”

5. Status Reports

Emily Mraovich gave an update on the Complete Streets Action Plan. At the next August meeting she will have more information on the Complete Streets implementation plan. There are 73 action items adopted in 2010. A final summary is almost completed. They are now working on wrapping up the next action plan 2.0 for improvements and new action items. The status chart for all 73 action items can be found on the website by Goggling Caltrans complete Streets. If there are any suggestions for the next action plan please contact the Office of Community Planning, Division of Transportation, or contact Emily by email at Emily_mraovich@dot.ca.gov.

6. Unfinished Business/Follow Up Items from Prior Meetings

- a. Jim Baross asked how to set up training for new members with no background on bike facilities. Maggie O’Mara suggested Dan Gutierrez is available for one-on-one training.
- b. Kevin Herritt on AB819 believes Caltrans is still in the right direction and received concurrence from two partners (legal cities and counties) there were no concerns with what was presented. The guidance will be posted on the website in the near future.

7. Legislative Update – Alan Wachtel

- AB 206 – allow Sacramento Regional Transit to use three bike racks on the front (extends beyond legal limit) also a route view committee – passed Senate Transportation Housing Committee and will next go to the Senate.
- AB 417 – provides CEQA exemption for bike plans, passed Assembly and is onto the Senate.
- AB 738 – for roads with bike lanes – a two year lane and no more action.
- AB 840 – DL Test includes involving bikes but changed to require applicants to know the dangers of distractive driving – acknowledged manual visual and cognitive.
- AB 1194 – Reinstate SRTS (not ATP) had 46 million taken out of the program. Passed Assembly and on to the Senate for 20% of funds for non infrastructure activities. There is a need for a full time hire to process and track the administration of these funds.
- AB 1371 – 3ft passing bill passed the Assembly and is now assigned to the Senate Transportation Housing Committee.

8. Topics for Next Meeting/Additional Items/Adjourn

- a. Election of Officers
- b. Approve April's CBAC Meeting notes
- c. Jerry Champa's presentation on intersections and roundabouts
- d. Dan Gutierrez's presentation on training Caltrans staff
- e. Membership solicitations/selection

Next Meeting August 1, 2013, Department of Transportation, 1227 O Street, Veterans Affairs Building Room 513, Sacramento, CA, 10AM to 3PM.

