

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Titus

Sent: Friday, April 27, 2012 2:52 PM

To: Kirk McClelland

Cc: 'Jim Titus' ; Gregory Slater ; Dustin Kuzan

Subject: RE: R4-11--followup clarifications

Greg and Kirk

Thanks for the clarifications on Virginia Manor, Kirk. I guess I probably have a question for Greg now. I just was copied on an email from Bob Herstein which seems to represent some progress on R4-11 implementation, but it may also portend an unfortunate step backward on policy, because it replaces R4-11 with the W-16 sign. During our call, I told you that I had heard rumblings from SHA staff that instead of posting the R4-11 along roads too narrow to share, that SHA would instead wanted to post the "Bicycles on Roadway" sign that had previously been rejected in favor of R4-11 and/or the yellow diamond sign with the same words "Bicycles may use full lane."

I thought I heard Greg say that everyone at Tom's level and above understood that SHA would use the R4-11 sign as previously indicated, though perhaps there were people below Tom's level who had not gotten the word. Can you clarify whether Bob's letter, which replaces R4-11 with a "Bike on Roadway" sign on many of the roads, is now the plan?

Thanks

Jim

-----Original Message-----

From: Dustin Kuzan

Sent: Friday, April 27, 2012 2:58 PM

To: Robert Herstein

Cc: Tom Hicks

Subject: FW: R4-11--followup clarifications

FYI. I'll keep Jim calm for as long as I can so he doesn't blow up social media.

-----Original Message-----

From: Tom Hicks

Sent: Friday, April 27, 2012 3:46 PM

To: 'Jim Titus'

Cc: Dustin Kuzan ; Robert Herstein ; Kirk McClelland ; Gregory Slater ; Julie Strain ; Michael Paylor (SHA) ; Cheryl Schreiber ; Billy Hwang ; Tom Hicks

Subject: RE: R4-11--followup clarifications

Hi Jim - we believe that there may be some misunderstanding on the bike sign issue. Based upon numerous discussions with various parties with various points of interest and concern, we believe that we are now proceeding in a fashion that best fits to interests of our road users.

- we are proceeding with the placement of a number of R4-11 signs along arterial routes leaving the Washington DC and Baltimore City areas, those areas from which a significant number of cyclists will travel

- the R4-11 signs will reinforce the State Law requirements; we plan on their placement at key points beyond, but likely not more than 1/2-mile distance apart

- we would like you and other cycling enthusiasts to give us feedback; we are starting in the PG/Mont County areas

- the R4-11 is an informational type sign, conveying State Law

- where safety issues are noted/develop, as attested to by our District Traffic Engineers, we will place the appropriate Warning signs per the Maryland Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices

- warning signs are not used indiscriminately, but are confined to situations that are unexpected or involve incidents

- warning signs are well-defined in Law

- no highway sign is taking the place of any other highway sign, as each has its own purpose to fulfill

Please let us know of any questions that you may have. We are happy to get moving on this program after all of this time in discussions. Thanks for your help.

From: Jim Titus

Sent: Monday, April 30, 2012 9:18 AM

To: Tom Hicks

Cc: 'Jim Titus' ; Dustin Kuzan ; Robert Herstein ; Kirk McClelland ; Gregory Slater ; Julie Strain ; Michael Paylor (SHA) ; Cheryl Schreiber ; Billy Hwang ; Tom Hicks

Subject: RE: R4-11--followup clarifications

Thanks Tom,

I appreciate very much your close attention to this issue. The misunderstanding may be left over from the debate last summer over whether to include two warning signs along with the R4-11. Perhaps I should start by summarizing my understanding (or lack thereof) and put my questions

at the end.

The confusion seems to have its origins in the ambiguity about what was decided (and what was being left for another day) when MDOT decided to stop vetting the W16-1 and “Bicycles May Use Full Lane” warning sign, as part of the R4-11 approval process for the MUTCD last fall. At different times last year, there were 3 or 4 different signage policies under consideration:

- (1) Substantial use of R4-11 signs on roads with lanes too narrow to share;
- (2) [a] Sparing use (or [b] no use) of R4-11 signs but widespread use of the yellow W16-1 signs on similar roads;
- (3) Sparing use (or no use) of R4-11 signs but widespread use of the yellow warning signs saying “Bicycles May Use Full Lane” or some other wording to that effect.

Different people supported different options:

- Michael Jackson supported (1);
- SHA staff supported (2) and (3);
- cyclists voiced their objection to (2b) in emails sent to key officials, but supported (1) and (3).

A letter from Secretary Swaim-Staley appeared to assure cyclists that MDOT would not adopt the policy to which the cyclists were objecting.

When SHA decided to omit guidance for the warning signs as part of the MUTCD adoption of the R4-11 sign, different government officials provided different interpretations about what had been decided. Michael Jackson told MBPAC that MDOT had decided to use the R4-11 sign and not the yellow signs to inform users of lanes too narrow to share, just as the federal MUTCD had previously done (i.e. policy 1), and consistent with a letter to cyclists from Secretary Swaim-Staley. Others indicated that because warning signs need not be in the MUTCD, the decision to not put the other signs into the MUTCD was an administrative decision, rather than a selection of a signage policy. The Secretary had promised that R4-11 guidance would be issued, but never actually said that the signs would be used. The actual policy would emerge later, when signage plans were developed, they said.

With these different perspectives, we have remained puzzled about what the SHA policy would be. The District 3 plan seems generally consistent with option 2a, but your explanation is more consistent with the policy that Michael Jackson thought was adopted when you say “we plan on their placement at key points beyond, but likely not more than 1/2-mile distance apart.”

1. Would it be possible to move forward with the R4-11 part of the District 3 signage plan, while holding off on the W16-1 signs? There seems to be no question that the R4-11 signs in the plan

are needed; the only question is whether the W16-1 signs should be posted, or whether another sign would be more appropriate (e.g. R4-11, or a different warning sign with more appropriate wording) in some of the locations where the plan anticipates W16-1.

2. Could a smaller subset of people on this email continue this dialogue, but focused on the details of 2 or 3 specific roads? It is unclear to me at this point, whether the misunderstanding reflects differing perspectives of the policy itself, or merely how that policy needs to be implemented. Getting into the specific details may help to refine SHA's approach, and will surely allow me to better explain to the larger cycling community the logic of SHA's approach.

Best regards

Jim

-----Original Message-----

From: Dustin Kuzan

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2012 5:07 PM

To: 'jtitus@risingsea.net'

Cc: Robert Herstein ; Lora Rakowski

Subject: RE: R4-11--followup clarifications

Jim,

I don't know if anyone got back to you on this but we are reviewing the sign locations for the "May Use Full Lane" sign. I believe we have an internal meeting with the Administrator on the sign on Monday or the following Monday perhaps. I realize that BTW day is in about a week, however, so we are trying to meet this date but if changes (in your favor) come out of the meeting on Monday it may be difficult to get them up by the end of the week. I know you were really looking forward to having the signs placed by this day and wanted to get a feel on how you would react if we missed the date. Thanks.

Dustin M. Kuzan

Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator

Office of Planning and Preliminary Engineering

Maryland State Highway Administration

707 N. Calvert St, Baltimore, MD 21202

Tel: 410-545-5656

dkuzan@sha.state.md.us

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Titus

Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2012 10:05 PM

To: Dustin Kuzan

Cc: Robert Herstein ; Lora Rakowski

Subject: Re: R4-11--followup clarifications

Hello Dustin,

Thanks for getting back to me. I am very glad to hear that you will be discussing this with the Administrator. Because the Secretary has been most supportive of the "Full Lane" sign, the Administrator may be in the best position to provide direction for what appears to be a need to balance the decision by the Secretary to proceed with the R4-11 sign against the reluctance of several traffic engineers within SHA to actually use them. As we've discussed many times, the cycling organizations like the R4-11 sign, are open to a yellow diamond warning sign that clearly communicates the same message, but oppose using the W16-1(2) along roads where using the full lane is warranted.

Bike to Work Day would be an excellent time to unveil the R4-11 signs, since the media will do stories about bikes on highways and the new R4-11 offers an opportunity to explain a key facet of bicycle safety that is poorly understood by most people. But if SHA is still weighing options, the calendar will offer other opportunities for a meaningful release. What's most important is defining an approach that will stand the test of time, which will require a true meeting of the minds between cyclists and the traffic safety experts. I think we had such a meeting of the minds last July, so I am sure that we can get to that point again; but it may take a meeting or two. Putting the signs up before Tom Hicks and Secretary Swaim-Staley retire, for example, still seems doable and could be a tribute to their respective contributions to bicycle safety on our highways.

Thanks again,

Jim