

SHA Draft Proposed Entry for 2012 MdMUTCD

Section 9B.06 Bicycles May Use Full Lane Sign (R4-11)

Option:

The Bicycles May Use Full Lane (R4-11) sign (see Figure 9B-2) may be used in locations to inform road users that bicyclists may occupy the travel lane where they might not normally be expected.

Support:

§21-1205(a)(6), Transportation Article, Md. Code Ann., allows bicyclists not to “ride as near to the right side of the roadway as practicable and safe when operating in a lane that is too narrow for a bicycle and another vehicle to travel safely side by side within the lane.”

The Uniform Vehicle Code (UVC) defines a “substandard width lane” as a “lane that is too narrow for a bicycle and a [motorized] vehicle to travel safely side by side within the same lane.”

Section 9C.07 describes a Shared Lane Marking that may be used in addition to the Bicycles May Use Full Lane warning sign (when used in accordance with the Standard in Paragraph 2) to inform road users that bicyclists might occupy the travel lane.

Titus suggested revisions for 2012 MdMUTCD

Section 9B.06 Bicycles May Use Full Lane Sign (R4-11)

Option:

The Bicycles May Use Full Lane (R4-11) sign (see Figure 9B-2) may be used to inform road users that bicyclists may occupy a travel lane that is too narrow for bicyclists and motor vehicles to safely operate side by side within the lane.

Support:

§21-1205(a)(6), Transportation Article, Md. Code Ann., provides an exception to the general requirement to “ride as near to the right side of the roadway as practicable and safe.... when operating in a lane that is too narrow for a bicycle and another vehicle to travel safely side by side within the lane.”

Section 9C.04A describes a Shared Lane Marking that may be used in addition to the Bicycles May Use Full Lane warning sign (when used in accordance with the Standard in subsection 9c.04A.b) to inform road users that bicyclists might occupy the travel lane.

Comment [JGT1]: These two words are superfluous.

Comment [JGT2]: This is from federal MUTCD 9B.06.01 In my revision is suggest alternative that tracks Maryland statute better than “where they might not normally be expected.”

Comment [JGT3]: This language is a bit confusing and not really accurate: R4-11 is appropriate even if cyclists are normally expected in the center of the travel lane; and it would not be expected if cyclists generally ride along the fog line (which would not normally be expected)

Comment [JGT4]: UVC is fine for federal MUTCD, but in Maryland it has been superceded by Md Code Trans §21-1205(a)(6).

Comment [JGT5]: These sections seem to refer to federal MUTCD paragraphs, but the paragraph numbers are different in the Maryland MUTCD. Note that the Maryland MUTCD is also more specific on this point, referring directly to sharrow placed in the center of the lane,