



“End ‘Share The Road’” article published by Bike Delaware on August 19, 2013 with a request for comments.

As of August 26, the article had received **8,606** unique page views and had been “liked” over **1,200** times.

Comments are appended below and may also be viewed at

<<http://www.bikede.org/2013/08/19/end-share-the-road/#commentspost>>

1. **(YES) Cyndi Steiner, LCI #2768** AUGUST 19, 2013 AT 9:38 AM Great article. My only comment relates to the use of R4-11- “May use full lane”. I disagree that it must be used in conjunction with a sharrow. Bicycles have the right to use the full lane without having a sharrow present under certain circumstances, mainly related to when the lane is too narrow to be shared- parked cars along the right side, a narrow bridge, other lane narrowing. In these cases, the cyclist is much safer taking the whole lane.
2. **(YES) Gary Beaton** AUGUST 19, 2013 AT 10:28 AM The Tour de Nuit Society has long campaigned against the use of “Share the Road” campaigns in the City of Calgary and to a lesser degree the Province of Alberta because of the mixed messaging this feeble marketing slogan conveys to the two diverse user groups — cyclists and automobile drivers. It is not that the average driver does not believe in neighbourliness or is fundamentally opposed to the concept of sharing. Everyone with siblings grows up with the concept of sharing ingrained in them.

“Share the Road” to a driver means: after he or she leaves home, completes the trip to work or the mall and no longer requires use of the infrastructure, he or she is happy to “share” it. Society’s massive investments in transportation infrastructure would otherwise be sitting there empty and devoid of cars. Our road and highway system was built to be shared. The subsidy argument aside, we could never have afforded it in the first place if it was not shared. The fundamental issue with “Share the Road” is the fact that it masks the huge inequality in the risk borne by the two user groups. As cyclists we bear all the risk of serious physical injury and death. Drivers bear virtually none. If the concept of risk was not so intangible cyclists would be better off with “Share the Risk” Campaigns. In addition to signage, such a campaign would probably consist of lobbying automobile manufacturers to remove safety features from cars: seatbelts, airbags, fenders, signal lights and doors. The concept of intermodal sharing of a limited and scarce resource that is a transportation network is unrelated to the definition of sharing that refers to intramodal usage. Astute ad men or ad women know this and avoid unintentionally sending mixed messages to the potential consumer or the public. “Share the Road” campaigns were not created by Madison Avenue advertisers; they are the legacy of traffic engineers from an era when no one had any interest in cycling. Times are a changing and we should not be content to suffer the (fatal) consequences of proselytizing PSA and patronizing safety slogans.

3. **(NO) Bill Pfaffenhauser** [AUGUST 19, 2013 AT 11:08 AM](#) I have always felt the sign to be rather benign and that it really doesn’t motivate anyone to do anything, cyclist or driver. As far as the “MAY USE FULL LANE” sign, I’m not so sure that also doesn’t mean anything to most drivers. We as cyclists know what it means to “take the lane” but I’d venture to say that it is probably more confusing than anything to a non cycling driver.

4. **(NO) Dan L** [AUGUST 22, 2013 AT 2:22 PM](#) .Frankly, I think that the advocates of such a recommendation are just guessing, or going from some anecdotal evidence. Is there any good data –biker & driver surveys, e.g.– to support their contention about interpretations? –speaking for myself, it seems a peculiar one, and exaggerated in significance at that. AND, I do concur in casting more doubt at the “BIKERS MAY

USE FULL LANE” sign, which surely is likely to be seen as a special privilege NOT in general allowance, so more likely to lead to misgivings about full-lane use in other situations. Hmmm, perhaps a better such sign –more to the point as an advisory to both sets of road users (car & bike)– is this : ” SHOULD USE FULL LANE” ! I.e., I see this as advising that the road conditions are such that it is advisable for cyclists to use the full lane, making that a governmental recommendation and not a cyclist choice (so sort of removing *blame* from the cyclist).

5. **(YES) eep223** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 5:09 PM](#) From my own experience, most drivers (at least in my town) have no idea that it is legal for cyclists to take up an entire lane. I think a “MAY USE FULL LANE” sign is needed to convey that message. I understand your point that motorists may not realize it is the entirety of the road and not just the areas where the signs are posted, but I think they are also less likely to react with hostility in general if they realize it is legal at all.

6. **(YES) Andrew J Besold LCI#2682** [AUGUST 19, 2013 AT 12:06 PM](#) You are spot on with this one but so is Cyndi. There are several narrow roadways in New Jersey that are VERY popular with cyclists where a sharrow would be inappropriate due to the posted speed limit being greater than 35mph (Canal Road in Somerset County for example). In many places I must use the full lane on said road because it is too narrow to share or there are numerous potholes (BTW – there are no potholes in Idaho but they use rough chip-seal WAY too often). I would love to see the “MAY USE FULL LANE” sign on Canal Road without sharrows to help inform drivers of the reality of bicyclists rights as I’ve had some bad incidents with impatient drivers on this road.

7. **(YES) Hussam Almulhim** [AUGUST 19, 2013 AT 6:06 PM](#) Just use the “May Use Full Lane” and discontinue the other two signs! The cyclist should always have the full lane even without the sharrows being present for many reasons. Having the sharrows only helps drivers to get the message. And I hope that its absence should not be used against the cyclists right to use the full lane.

8. **(YES) Gordon** [AUGUST 19, 2013 AT 8:30 PM](#) “Entitled To Full Lane”

9. **(YES) John** AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 3:48 PM I agree in spirit, but the signs just aren't big enough.
10. **(YES) Thomas Kohn** AUGUST 19, 2013 AT 8:49 PM I believe the sign "Bicycles may use full lane" to be the best choice among all three. The "share the road" sign offers too much ambiguity, whether for sharing by position or sharing by time of use (as described for both in more detail in other comments). The pictured bicycle sign indicates much too little information to be of use. As for signage on the street itself, I believe the interfitted chevrons is confusing by its abstraction and by locating the chevrons in only one lane. Frequently, any vehicle needs to use other lanes; for example, to make a left-hand turn, to pass another vehicle. The chevron could well be understood to mean that bicyclists may use only the marked lane. Similarly for non-protected bike lane markings on the street: their presence can be wrongly understood to relegate cycle traffic to the marked lane.
11. **HoppingBird** AUGUST 19, 2013 AT 9:41 PM Cyclist in Roadway – so just the bike picture. The message should convey it is expected for bikes to be in the road – like a car or a motorcycle with the same rules applied.
12. **(YES) Richard C. Moeur** AUGUST 19, 2013 AT 10:11 PM The evidence seems to indicate the W16-1P SHARE THE ROAD plaque was originally added to the MUTCD at the behest of farm equipment interests, not bicyclists. In the intervening 16 years, it's become clear that the term "share" is interpreted in such a widely varying manner by different road users that the plaque does not seem to be sending a clear & uniform message. In fact, I've had police officers pull me over and tell me I wasn't "sharing" when I was occupying a 10-foot-wide travel lane. The R4-11 Bicycles MAY USE FULL LANE sign seems to convey a much-clearer message in terms of cyclist lane use. The reason the sign uses the word "may" is because it's up to the bicyclist to choose to use the lane width as they deem appropriate – in discussions at NCUTCD, other options were deemed to order the bicyclist to use the lane, which isn't really appropriate. And there is not a requirement to use shared lane markings with the R4-11 (or vice versa) – they are two separate tools in the traffic engineering toolbox. It's up to DeIDOT to choose which signs are most appropriate

- for their state highways. Having worked with DelDOT traffic staff on national committees, I think they're aware of these issues and can make the best decision when given good justifications for doing so.
13. **(YES) Mark Deshon** AUGUST 20, 2013 AT 10:41 AM I think the use of the two alternative signs mentioned does remove possible ambiguity. I also agree that it's better philosophically to get rid of wording that even hints to motorists that it's their road to share. Simpler signage without words (like W11-1) works better for those who don't read English and gives a simple, quick indicator to both motorists and cyclists. I like the R4-11 signage and hope one day we won't need that one, but I can see it's specific use on certain roads.
 14. **(YES) Preston Tyree** AUGUST 20, 2013 AT 11:43 AM James, Great initiative. Now we need to spread it to other states. Over the years I have sold or given away over 15,000 lapel pins with the bicycle and Share the Road message. It makes a great conversation starter and is unambiguous in the context of a lapel pin. The people in the room know exactly what it means. However, I agree that it stinks as a roadside sign. Good luck and let me know what I can do to help.
 15. **(YES) leo Stone** AUGUST 20, 2013 AT 3:50 PM I want my state, Washington, to do the same thing and get rid of Share The Road signs. Those signs convey the idea that the cyclist should move over to the right and share the lane with the cars, but most of the time those are in places where the cyclist need the lane to themselves, like a narrow section. Bikes May Use Full Lane is more accurate, reduces conflict, and is a simple message.
 16. **(YES) Jym** AUGUST 20, 2013 AT 10:08 PM • "Share the Road" is pretty useless, since it can be and has been taken to mean "don't take the lane." Even worse is when the words are accompanied by a graphic showing a bike crowded way over onto the right side by a car passing much too close. The "**Jym** AUGUST 20, 2013 AT 10:09 PM (Whoops, my last sentence was chopped. I put a Unicode bicycle in it.) The "[Bicycle] May Use Full Lane" (BMUFL) sign is concise and sufficient.
 17. **(YES) Bossi** AUGUST 21, 2013 AT 9:09 AM Agreed with the point regarding

W16-1P “Share the Road” — it implies bicyclists can’t use the full lane and implies that where there aren’t signs bicyclists shouldn’t be in the road. I can be favorable toward R4-11 “May Use Full Lane” signs, but I do have a bit of a pet peeve about putting up regulatory signs that restate what is already law... it can imply that wherever there *isn’t* a sign bicyclists are not permitted to use the full lane. Though I’ll concede that in specific cases such signs can be beneficial, care must be taken to ensure that benefit is not lessened through overuse. As for W11-1 signs I share similar sentiments... but without a clear message (as the R4-11 has) warning signs such as this need come with a very specific hazard that affirms the sign to motorists... otherwise, I view warning signs more as liability escapes — slap-on treatments for situations that are not properly designed (in this case, roads not properly designed for safe cycling). I’m not sure I’d be fond of using W11-1s along corridors with lots of bicyclists, as the bicyclists themselves should provide more awareness than a sign would — I’d rather motorists pay attention to the road than the roadside. But at bicycle crossings, where it’s a very specific point where conflicts may occur more suddenly — then I could see these (or perhaps signs with both ped & bike symbols) being more applicable in advance and at the crossings. As for sharrows- it’s worth considering whether sharrows are placed along the side of the lane or at the center of the lane, giving different implications of shared lanes vs bicyclists using the full lane... which I believe is rather contextual and depends on a number of roadway factors as to where placement is best.

18. **Ed** [AUGUST 21, 2013 AT 12:02 PM](#) I hesitate with “May Use Full Lane” because it implies that bicyclists cannot use the full lane on roads where the sign is not present. Why not a “Give 3-Foot When Passing” with the bike symbol, or is it too late for that?
19. **Matt Moore** [AUGUST 21, 2013 AT 1:14 PM](#) When I cycled in France, I noticed signs posted at regular intervals that showed a picture of a cyclist as seen from behind and arrows on both sides with 3 meters above the arrows to show how much room a motor vehicle must give a cyclist. Very effective.
20. **(YES) Will Wattles** [AUGUST 21, 2013 AT 1:30 PM](#) I’ve always been uneasy with the “Share the Road” slogan. It seems to undermine the idea that a cyclist is a legal vehicle with access to the road albeit with limits. It may suggest that this is a nice thing to do but not required. I like the

sign mentioned in France that reminds motorists about the requirement to leave room when overtaking a bike. Most motorists haven't read a motor vehicle law book since they got their driver's license.

21. **Manuel Ramos** [AUGUST 21, 2013 AT 1:57 PM](#) I am stunt that a liberal state is having this problem. It is unfortunate that this is happening but it just gives me another good reason not to visit a place where cyclist are not welcome and most important a place that I won't feel safe riding my bike. I was just thinking on visiting my sister there, sorry it is not going to happened.
22. **Prattle On, Boyo** [AUGUST 21, 2013 AT 2:52 PM](#) Misinterpretation is what happens when any campaign is rolled out minus context or education. The answer is to furnish exactly what "share the road" means starting with driver education followed up with cyclist education of the various biking organizations.
23. **Rider X** [AUGUST 21, 2013 AT 3:32 PM](#) How about, "You're in a car, get your head out of your ass and pay attention!" That would be a cool sign...
24. **(YES) Josh Putnam** [AUGUST 21, 2013 AT 3:35 PM](#) The conflicting interpretations of "Share the Road" are more serious than an academic discussion of giving up rights or sharing a common good. Motorists see "share the road" as a call for bicyclists to ride far enough to the right that motorists can overtake within the lane. Cyclists and the law see "share the road" as a reminder that motorists must give due care when overtaking slower traffic, including bicycles, even if that means having to wait for a safe opportunity to pass. The "share the road" sign encourages motorists to harass cyclists who are not sharing their *lane* rather than the *road*. I don't believe any amount of driver's ed will dispel the misinterpretation of "Share the Road" — that message is simply too ambiguous. Go with MUTCD's "Bicycles May Use Full Lane" when signing any road with an outside lane too narrow for a cyclist and motorist to safely operate side-by-side entirely within the lane.

25. **(YES) Alan Migdall** AUGUST 21, 2013 AT 10:30 PM I agree that “Share the Road” signs are often misinterpreted by motorists. I have suggested to our DOT and bike advocacy groups that when they are used, that below the “Share the road” sign should be a little sign with the word “with” and below that should be the diamond bike emblem sign. That way the combination of signs reads “share the road with bicycles”, which is a much clearer message and should be less likely to be misinterpreted. I believe that I saw that combination of signs somewhere but I cannot remember where. Also my suggestion uses two existing MUTCD signs so it should be able to be implemented with little bureaucratic resistance.
26. **(YES) Coach Joe** AUGUST 22, 2013 AT 12:20 AM In coaching both beginner & elite level cyclists, this is a hot topic for all involved. I am against “Share the Road” signs – I am more in favor of “Respect a Shared Road” but realize it is too much for a sign. The bicycle silhouette would do just fine. Unfortunately, the motorcyclists also have “Share the Road” campaigns as well—same sign, but with motorcycle on it. The new 3 foot passing laws are also not on my list of things good for cyclists . . . does not seem to be enough room for any cyclist in my opinion. How was that distance determined? How about 6 feet? Is that enough room for beginner cyclists? Pretty soon we will all be wearing the “slow moving vehicle” triangles with a bicycle in them, on our team kits which would at least give a legal basis for defense when we are hit by motor vehicles . . . Be visible, ride as the situation demands, & always be willing to change and adapt to the conditions as they occur . . . Coach Joe
27. **Richard C. Moeur** AUGUST 22, 2013 AT 1:33 AM Have to be careful with “3-foot-separation” signs – those have been interpreted by police & others as directing bicyclists to always stay at least 3 feet to the right of other traffic, whether that’s in the gutter, on the sidewalk, or in the dirt (regardless of what the actual law says). And by the time the sign has enough verbiage added to clarify things, it becomes an unreadable mess. :\
28. **Jerry Foster** AUGUST 22, 2013 AT 7:59 AM Agree the focus should be more specific re: to how to share, i.e. how motorists are expected to safely

pass bicyclists. Haven't seen the French sign but like the idea – maybe propose a sign showing a motorist passing a bicyclist on double yellow line giving plenty of space, maybe 2/3rds of the car over the line?

29. **(YES) Owen Howlett** [AUGUST 22, 2013 AT 1:59 PM](#) Very eloquently stated! Along with, I think, the majority of bicycle advocates, I'd like to see the use of "share the road" signs discontinued for exactly the reasons you've given.
30. **(YES) Brian Tilton** [AUGUST 22, 2013 AT 3:16 PM](#) I agree with these proposed changes, but I am not a resident of Delaware. Here in New Hampshire, we have been making strides at making motorists aware that bikes belong in the road. The "BIKE MAY USE FULL LANE" signs are used in Concord approaching intersections controlled by 4-way stop signs and traffic lights. In between those, the sharrows are used. It is positive reinforcement to drivers that "bikes belong here". The simple diagram of a bicycle is also positive reinforcement because it alerts motorists that they may see bicycles in the road (just like the deer and moose signs). I find that in areas with these kinds of postings, there is virtually no conflict between road users. The "Share the Road" slogan is totally useless as I usually end up in useless debates with others on who is "allowed" to share the road based on their own actions. I think these proposed changes are a huge step in the right direction, I strongly recommend sharrows as well.
31. **Richard C Beck III** [AUGUST 22, 2013 AT 9:43 PM](#) The "road" is actually public linear property to allow citizens the freedom to cross over private properties without paying a fee to rich land owners. It is defined space dedicated for ALL traveling citizens to use. Just because some users are bigger and capable of going faster does not give them special privileges to use the space selfishly and recklessly. You will share the public space with other legitimate space users. Whoever is moving in front of you on the Public road HAS THE RIGHT OF WAY, period. That's why our vehicles have brakes. NOBODY "owns" the public travel space. Share the space and quit intimidating other people legally on the pathway. This includes all travelers on recreation trails. The bigger and faster the vehicle the more liability they are assigned responsively. Traffic safety signage

indicating caution as bicyclists are present are appreciated except what do motorists have to do on roads where there are no special safety signs?

32. **(YES) Stephen Bertolini** AUGUST 23, 2013 AT 1:59 PM I live in North Wilmington (New Castle County, Delaware); I saw the Bike Delaware post in March 2012 about DelDOT slowly retiring the Share the Road (STR) signs. I've found another 10 or so new STR signs added since the 2 mentioned in the 2012 comments, so new signs are still being added. Most of these are on Silverside Road where a turn lane is added to the two traffic lanes. To accommodate the third lane, the bike lane stripe is painted to the gutter. Motorists see the bike lane width reduced to the gutter pan along with a sign that is apparently directed at bicyclists telling them to let others use the road too. I support the request to remove the STR signs (or at least stop adding more). I find most motorists understand bicyclists in the road in front of them; disappearing bike lanes and STR signs are evidently too ambiguous for the few others, so I see no benefits from STR signs. As noted in 2012 comments, a few motorists have told me the STR sign and no bike lane mean I have to let motorists go and stay out of their way so they don't run me over. (There was no other traffic, and they did not run me over.) I favor the [Bicyclists] May Use Full Lane signs (BMUFL). To commenters afraid motorists will think it is prohibited in the absence of this sign, I don't think this will cause any new problems. Traffic in Wilmington is usually low speed city traffic, yet this is where I find (a regular minority of) motorists telling me I'm not allowed to ride in the street if there is a side walk, if there is no bike lane, at night, during the day, etc. The reason I'm riding slowly is because all the cars in front of me won't get out of my way, and lots of them stop completely every time the traffic light turns red. I noticed that the Delaware MUTCD (Section 9B.06) restricts the BMUFL sign to designated bicycle routes (<http://regulations.delaware.gov/register/july2011/final/mutcd/Part9.pdf>, page 9)(a) Does this include the Regional and Connector bicycle routes (such as Silverside Road) on the DE State bike map? (http://www.deldot.gov/information/community_programs_and_services/bike/pdf/maps/NewCastle_Coverside.pdf?11th%20Nov%202012%2004:45:21%20PM)(b) Per the MUTCD (DE Revision) Use of the Bicycles May Use Full Lane (R4-11) sign may be used based on engineering judgment Does this mean BMUFL is allowed in DE in

other locations, including roads that may not be designated bicycle routes? Who determines and publicizes the designation used to allow BMUFL? Stephen Bertolini

33. **(YES) Tom Price** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 9:07 AM](#) “‘Bicycle’ may use full lane” makes a lot more sense than the more ambiguous ‘Share the road’. Many motorists have the mistaken assumption that bicycles should be restricted to sidewalks or the road shoulders.

34. **Dave Duncan** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 9:09 AM](#) Maybe it’s my cynical nature at work here, but I think that this debate over which sign to use to alert motorists about the rights of bicyclists on public roads is about as productive as having a debate over the color of speed limit signs in order to make motorists obey said speed limits. Honestly, I would love to think that changing the text and implied meaning of a road sign regarding the presence of bicyclists on any public road (minus interstates) would both educate and enlighten motorists to properly “share the road” with cyclists, but I’d have to make a leap of faith in people actually paying attention to and then obeying the signs...regardless of what’s posted on them. If there’s a way to effectively remove the ignorance and/or callousness from some motorists who seem to have an inherent disdain for cyclists, I’m all for it. If a sign change will do that, great. If not, it’s just throwing more good money after bad and we’ll again find that what is on the sign...any sign...is not the heart of the problem. Now, if we can get more motorists on a bicycle and get them to view life on the road from a different perspective, we might be on to something...

35. **(YES) Connie Fazio** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 9:49 AM](#) I find the “Share the Road” sign not useful anymore and would like to see the “May Use Full Lane” signs replace them and added to other roadways.

36. **(YES) Michelle Poyourow** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 12:42 PM](#) I absolutely agree. I have had many “pointless and time-wasting arguments” on the road about what it means to “share.” I have had people yell “Share the road!” at me while I was bicycling no matter what my lane position was. Vague, moralistic messages like “Share the road!” aren’t nearly as helpful as specific, practical messages like “Give 3 feet when

- passing” or “Check your blindspot at bike lanes.”
37. **(YES) Michael McDonald** AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 1:11 PM I agree. I just had this argument with friends and family and that sign is perceived exactly as you describe.
 38. **(YES) Ken Steinhoff** AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 1:29 PM I vote for SHOULD Use Full Lane, which make it an advisory, much like curve signs that have speed suggestions on them. The motorist doesn't have to take the curve at that speed, but it's a clue that's a safe speed. SHOULD Use Full Lane lets the cyclist and the motorist know the lane is too narrow for a safe pass. I've never liked the idea of Share the Road. As pointed out, motorists interpret it the wrong way. After all, you don't see signs with photos of cars on them that say Share the Road as a reminder to 18-wheelers not to run over 4-wheelers.
 39. **(YES) Dan** AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 1:36 PM I fully agree that the “Share The Road” signage is, in essence a waste of time. What message I'd like to see conveyed on signage, in regards to cyclists on the road is: “That person riding that bike up ahead of you, in the road could be a parent, a grand-parent, a sibling/cousin/uncle etc... That person could be a firefighter, EMT or police officer who will not be able to respond to that 911 call to save your mom later today, because you're about to maim or kill them when you run them off the road or hit them because you weren't paying attention or maybe you were texting or maybe you just wanted to get close to them to teach them a lesson about “sharing the road”. I am a son, a brother, a cousin, an uncle, a husband, a father, a grand-father. And yes, I am a fire fighter/EMT/reserve police officer. I ride my bike to keep me fit so I can be all those people I just mentioned and to be able to save your mom when she calls for help. Could you please just give me 3 feet or more of space? In my opinion, signage is very important, but not as important as education. The non-cycling community needs to be given the information as it relates to rights-on-the roads. This needs to be a part of all driver's ed programs.
 40. **Keith** AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 1:45 PM Anything along with “sharrows” is a waste of time. Anywhere that I know of that there is a sharrow, you wouldn't want to ride a bike. Drivers in my area assume cyclists are

fair game no matter what sign, sharrow, marking, plaque, silhouette or anything else you put up. It is a matter of if they don't know what the law is, they just make up their own. If no one enforces the law, it is bound to be broken.

41. **Anne** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 2:10 PM](#) Who is so insane as to think that a vehicle traveling 30 miles an hour with a gross vehicle weight of 2 tons can be safe within the same travel lane as one at the same speed with a vehicle weight of less than one hundred pounds? Bicyclist should take responsibility for the fact that they can get hurt and killed if they want to place themselves in that danger. Narrow roads, drinking drivers, poor visibility, are only some of the additional hazards. Not until bikes have their own travel lanes will our roadways be safe for both.
42. **Spiffy** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 2:54 PM](#) You're right, it's insane to think that we can trust people to operate a two-ton machine safely in close proximity to people. They never allow things like that to mingle on job sites. Remember, bicycling isn't dangerous, motor vehicles are.
43. **Chris** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 2:41 PM](#) I agree with previous commentors, that a sign showing a bicyclists and designating the required passing distance on each side would be the best option. The bicycle alone doesn't really say much, to me anyway, and the "May Use Full Lane" sign, as already stated, may lead people to think cyclists cannot use the full lane where the sign isn't present.
44. **Randall Hough** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 2:41 PM](#) I think the bicycle lobby in the USA should be promoting licensing of both human powered vehicles and the riders/drivers of those vehicles. The taxpayers that funded the roads they ride on should have some assurance that *like every other road user* these vehicles and operators are equally regulated. Bicycles should fund the creation and maintenance of bicycle paths/lanes from the use taxes and licensing fees they pay. The only reason that any motor vehicle operator has any problem treating bicycles as other traffic with full rights of usage is the entitlement attitude of the operators that think it is their right to operate an unregistered, uninsured vehicle with no operator's license on the public streets. No

other class of road user gets away with this, not even pedestrians. Become part of the registered, insured, licensed group of road users and you will get treated equally. Until that happens you have no right to use the roads. If a motorcyclist tried half of the crap that bicyclists pull on a regular basis they would lose their driving privilege. With no registration or proof of insurance bicyclists operate as if they are above the law. That tends to upset legitimate road users. Cheers, Randy

45. **Spiffy** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 2:56 PM](#) If other road users were killing 30,000 people a year in the US then I'm sure they'd regulate them a lot more. Come to think of it, sounds like we need more motor-vehicle regulations if we're letting people kill 30,000 others a year with them.
46. **Karl Pelletier** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 3:00 PM](#) Agreed – a test and even a nominal fee would eliminate a significant argument against bikes. It also gives us all a little more skin in the game (or on the tarmac). That said, most of us already pay taxes and car-related fees, so you can't assume that without additional regulation we are without equal rights on the road.
47. **Angelo Dolce** [AUGUST 27, 2013 AT 3:20 AM](#) *RE Randall Houghton* *No other class of road user gets away with this, not even pedestrians. ... Become part of the registered, insured, licensed group of road users and you will get treated equally.* If this is your complaint to the Bicycle Lobby in the USA, I have to ask: Where in the USA are pedestrians licensed, insured and registered? What are the penalties for unlicensed pedestrians? Since children can't buy insurance or get registered, are they prohibited from walking to protect from the dangers or uninsured and unregistered pedestrians?
48. **(YES) Spiffy** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 2:48 PM](#) Yes, please discontinue the use of Share the Road. I don't feel that we need any signs. Many motorists think that bicycles are only allowed when there's a bicycle sign nearby. It would be like putting up a sign to warn motorists that motorists may be on the road. Maybe we need a more generic "Caution: Everything" sign.
49. **Karl Pelletier** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 2:57 PM](#) How about "Collision with

Cyclist may result in 20 years to life for Vehicular Homicide”. We can work on the phrasing, but the sentiment is critical. Both bike and cars have rights to the road, and whether or not you like cyclists, we have rights and not respecting those can have dire consequences. Share the Peace.

50. **(YES) RG** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 3:18 PM](#) If proper research were done, I suspect “Share the Road” would often be construed by motorists “share the WIDTH of the lane”. ie: Cyclist, you go to the right next to the curb, while I whizz by you, all WITHIN the lane. That’s sharing, no ?As in.... “We’re both driving on the same lane at the same time (ie: sharing!), and since cars go faster I’ll simply use my 80% of the width of the lane the way I normally do, and you, cyclist, use your 20% of the lane the way you normally use it”.
51. **(YES) J. Wrinn** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 3:28 PM](#) Even Cops find this sign confusing. I pulled up behind a police officer pulled over into the bike lane (so she could talk on her cell phone). Finding no other option, I waited until traffic in the “Car Lane” was free and passed her. She then proceeded to pull me over to inform me that the line I was in was intended for cars. Upon informing her that she was parked in my travel lane she responded “that lanes is for broken down cars, and or other motorized vehicles to stop on the side of the road”. She was parked directly on top of the painted bike sign on the lane and was in plain sight of a “Share the Road” sign.
52. **(NO) Boo Edmonds** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 4:13 PM](#) I always thought “Share the Road” meant just that: SHARE THE ROAD. My son always kept a Share the Road bumper sticker on his vehicles. In 2009, while on a training ride he and a friend were killed by a drunk driver. I now spread the word he so adamantly believed in. I would be sad to see the Share the Road signs discontinued. I believe in Sharing the road.....just not with drunks.
53. **Charlie Madden** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 7:20 PM](#) My basic belief is: Same road same rules.Common sense tells us interstates and other high speed roads are inappropriate for bicycles. Parallel alternative routing (bike trails, etc.) must be made available for those situations.

54. **(NO) Rachel B** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 7:59 PM](#) I personally like seeing Share the Road signs. Although I agree that they may not be the most useful in getting across all laws regarding cyclists in the road (what sign would, really?), I think it does some good, at least in my area. Many people tell me that it is illegal for me to be on the road and I need to be on a sidewalk or trail (people even say this when there isn't a sidewalk or trail!). The sign at least indicates that it's legal for me to be there, and I think jogs the memory of those who already are aware of the rather well-known law, rather than making it seem as an "exception". Speaking of which...I do not like the sign indicating that cyclists MAY use the full lane, as that most certainly indicates that it is a special circumstance and that cyclists MAY NOT take the lane at other times. The majority of people that I have spoken with are not aware that it is legal for cyclists to take the lane in any circumstance, even those people who know it's legal for us to be on the road. I find myself explaining this one a lot.
55. **(YES) lou mason** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 8:35 PM](#) I agree to get rid of that particular sign, but put a better one up immediately
56. **(NO) EB** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 9:43 PM](#) Where I live (New Zealand), the concept of sharing the road with people on bikes is still strange enough to many motor vehicle operators that "Share the Road" signs have educational value; as a previous poster notes, some drivers genuinely seem to think that bicycles are not allowed in the roadway, much less allowed to take the lane. I don't like the wordless bike symbol because it seems to suggest that people on bikes are no more than possible obstructions, like fallen rocks or wandering livestock. And, as noted, "May use full lane" seems just as ambiguous as "Share the Road," though in a different way. So here, I'm okay with STR for now. Took the lane on the way home and was buzzed and screamed by a woman with a "Baby on Board" placard, apparently oblivious to any irony in her attitude to road safety.
57. **(YES) Robin Randels** [AUGUST 26, 2013 AT 11:59 PM](#) Please discontinue "share the road". Sharing implies that it's optional to do so — like motorists are doing some big favor for cyclists. sharing is NOT optional. The much more clearly stated sign " Bicycles may use full

lane” conveys the message.