

CITY OF AUSTIN
BICYCLE ADVISORY COUNCIL (BAC)
MEETING SUMMARY

City Hall
301 W. 2nd Street
AUSTIN, TX 78704
July 19, 2012

PARTICIPANTS:

Chris LeBlanc – BAC Chair
Ellen Gibbs - BAC
Tommy Eden – BAC

Allison Kaplan - BAC
Richard Faidley – BAC
John Bartle – Alt BAC
Myndi Swanson – Alt BAC

Elliot McFadden – Alt BAC
Tom Wald – Alt BAC
Tom Thayer – Alt BAC
Zach Stern – Alt BAC

STAFF PRESENT:

Nadia Barrera

District Representative Michelle
Borton

Annick Beaudet
Officer Spain

GUESTS:

Michael Cospere
Doug McLaren

Adrienne White
Rich Hollenbeck
Noni Jarnagin

Patrick Jones
Gonzalo Camacho

1. Introductions – Mr. LeBlanc begins the meeting with introductions
2. Review and Approval of June Minutes - After adding a few changes, there is a motion to approve by Ms. Kaplan which is seconded by Mr. Faidley, and approved by the group.
3. Items from BAC –
 - Discussion and Possible Action: Bicycle Parking Code Amendments – Mr. Wald introduces the discussion and states that the subcommittee wanted to make the amendments stronger. Specifically by addressing the difference between incentives and requirements for showers. Ms. Kaplan discusses the difference between short and long term secure parking. She mentions that for some reason, the word “secure” is not included in the revised code amendment draft, these changes should be made on page 8 and the top of page 9 of page 14 of the draft. Ms. Beaudet suggests adding “secure” to D(2). Mr. Faidley asks if the point of D(2) is for long-term parking. Ms. Beaudet confirms that it is. Mr. Wald recommends adding (e) includes, “and in a secure location.” Mr. Faidley confirms that this change does not then preclude a developer from putting “secure” parking not conveniently located. Mr. Jarnagin states that a security camera does not stop theft. Ms. Beaudet states that we should remove the security camera portion of the definition. Ms. Kaplan also requests striking “or” from (a). Mr. Jones recommends having “secure” being part of (a) and then “and” for everything else. Mr. LeBlanc also suggests removing the “viewable from an employee area.” Ms. Beaudet recommends stating at the “street level of a covered motor vehicle parking facility.” Moving on, Mr. Wald states that 50’ is just too far away for most buildings and 15’ is preferable. Mr. Stern recommends using the scale of the building as a prescriptive measure. Mr. LeBlanc agrees that it could be based on the percentage of the front door, or the size of the building. Mr. Cospere asks if there should be sight line distance from the front door. Ms. Beaudet states

that a sight line requirement will be very prescriptive and will be difficult to review for the Planning Department. Mr. LeBlanc asks if the group was satisfied with the bike parking at City Hall before the new racks were installed on Cesar Chavez. The group in general says it wasn't and that the new racks are much more convenient. Ms. Kaplan states that Tucson does have a 30' requirement. Mr. Eden suggests trying 30' because there is a precedent in other places. The group agrees. Mr. Faidley asks if there is a distance parking for handicap parking. Mr. Comacho responds that it is the closest parking spot to the door. Mr. Faidley suggests stating that the bicycle parking should be located as close as handicapped parking. Ms. Beaudet states that the BAC comments will be included in a spreadsheet with internal comments, which will then help staff to develop a recommendation. Mr. Wald moves to have another subcommittee meeting to review the amendments and Ms. Kaplan seconds. Ms. Beaudet states that we should go to APD and then we can come back to the code amendments tonight. [continuation of conversation, after APD presentation] Add (d) except for handicapped parking. Ms. Beaudet recommends, "the first 50% of parking shall not be obscured from view for the approach to the principal entrance." Ms. Beaudet will clarify with legal if it is necessary to clarify that the specifications and short and long-term parking definitions are included in the TCM. Ms. Beaudet clarifies that the incentive for showers should stay, and that she would be friendly to exploring an option for requiring showers. Mr. Wald recommends the BAC develop minimum standards for these amendments overall and return to staff with their resolution. This also allows others to discuss these with Council members and developers. Mr. Wald also requests that staff use the City of San Francisco ordinance as a guide. Ms. Beaudet states that an option could be to require the shower before the certificate of occupancy. Mr. Jarnagin states that the San Francisco ordinance does not include provision of showers for renovations and remodels and also addresses proximity. Ms. Kaplan also suggests that a developer could reduce parking even more if the showers are made available to the public. Ms. Beaudet recommends that we use the public shower incentives for governmental organizations and public buildings, or those that a built with a substantial partnership from the City. Mr. LeBlanc recommends adding that the definition of "principal" building entrance should be open during all business hours. Mr. Eden recommends adding, "include at least one bicycle rack at each entrance." Ms. Beaudet will look at the hours of operation question. Mr. Wald asks if the group will make a BAC resolution. Ms. Barrera states that staff will develop a recommendation and get legal to develop a new draft code amendment. Then staff will let the BAC know when the amendment has been revised, and then they can decide if the subcommittee should meet again to review and produce comments.

- Discussion: Garbage Cans in Bicycle Lanes – Mr. Jarnagin states that he has heard of cyclists having a hard time with trash bins in bicycle lanes. Ms. Beaudet states that there is an ordinance that states that there is a time frame with which you need to retract your trash bin. Mr. Wald asks if staff could report back on how many bicycle lanes would be affected by trash cans in the bike lane. Ms. Beaudet states that she will report back.
- By-laws: Mr. LeBlanc will review the by-laws and will be on the next agenda.
- Shoal Creek Trail: Mr. LeBlanc asks to be updated on the closure of the Shoal Creek Trail and for it to be put on the next agenda.

4. Items from Staff – 6:50-7:55

- Briefing: [ADD APD RESPONSE FROM REYES] Quarterly APD Report – District Representative (DR) Borton and Officer Spain introduces themselves. There is an area

that says “collisions” that should be “citations.” Mr. LeBlanc asks how often the bicycle officers issue citations. DR Borton states that often times downtown it is difficult to catch a cyclist. She does state that she sees fewer violations downtown when she is on her bicycle. Mr. LeBlanc asks how many bicycle patrols there are downtown. DR Borton states it varies. It could be from 2-4 during the day and from 3-8 at night. Mr. Jones asks about “failure to ride to the right” citations. DR Borton says she cannot speak to that. She also states that the majority of cyclists that get citations downtown are delivery type cyclists. Mr. Wald notes that the percentage of citations and collisions of are proportionately lower than expected given the projected number of cyclists; the data gives the idea that collisions are not as common for cyclists as they are for motorists. Ms. Kaplan asks why the percentages of collisions and citations change so significantly change from '09 to '10. Mr. Cosper asks if when he had his bicycle accidents and was picked up by EMS if those crashes were reported. He would like to know if EMS keeps bicycle crash statistics. Mr. Bartle asks about the 3' law. DR Borton responds that it is a violation and is up to officer discretion. Mr. Hollenbeck Asks about a video of a motor vehicle violating the vulnerable user law. DR Borton states that she would have a hard time writing a ticket for that offense if she does not actually see the infraction. Ms. Beaudet states that it would be better to have the analyst come to a future meeting. Mr. LeBlanc states that it would make sense to have an analyst come once a year and have officers come once a year would make sense. Mr. Jarnagin states that he read that APD has been monitoring where high incidence of motor vehicle collisions. DR Borton states that Mr. Jarnagin is probably referring to APD's Highway Division. Mr. Jarnagin asks if there is any chance that APD would monitor intersections with high bicycle collisions. DR Borton says that downtown they have made recommendations to the City and have asked for Highway Enforcement to execute more enforcement in those high collision locations. Mr. Wald asks about citations given for running stop signs and the Uniform Tolerance Policy. It is his understanding that if a cyclist is traveling at a pedestrian speed; is it at the officer's discretion to give the citation? Ms. Beaudet states that she knows that the Uniform Tolerance Policy has changed to be less prescriptive and more general. Mr. Faidley asks about riding on a sidewalk and the citations in the report. DR Borton responds that it is illegal downtown.

- Discussion and Possible Action: Barton Springs Road Proposed Facilities –Mr. Wald asks about the positioning of the delineator posts. Ms. Beaudet states that the positioning will be decided in the field. Mr. Wald states that there are concerns about being able to make a left where needed and ending the buffered lane before the intersection so that cars can merge into the lanes to make turns. He also stated that there was concern about the mixing of bicycles and pedestrians on the mixed-use trail. Mr. Hollenbeck asks how wide the multi-use path is. Ms. Beaudet states that it is 10'. Mr. Jones states that the bicycle lane near Daily Juice is questionable. Ms. Beaudet states that the bicycle lanes will be made wider where possible. Mr. Wald asks for some indication through S. 1st Street at Barton Springs to alert drivers to bicycles crossing. Ms. Beaudet also states that the intersection at Lamar needs bicycle symbols through the intersection. Mr. Eden also asks to have the timing changed at the signal at Lamar to be longer to allow for cyclists to move through. Ms. Beaudet states that she will look into it. Mr. LeBlanc states that the bicycle lanes are difficult to see. Ms. Beaudet states that colored lanes may help in this location. Mr. LeBlanc agrees. Ms. Kaplan asks if there can be more signage where the

bike lane ends near Barton Creek. Ms. Beaudet states that the bicycle lane will be extended; there will be a ramp added, and a sharrow. Ms. Beaudet states that staff will look at the sign. Mr. Wald moves that the BAC supports the project as shown tonight with staff's consideration of the items represented in the minutes and those concerns voiced in the previous meeting:

- Bike lanes on restaurant row to either brighten the line or color
- Look at widths in general also in front of Daily Juice
- Wider radius at Dawson where the path junction is
- At intersections, include dashing or other delineation
- Look at intersections in general to guide new riders, especially at Lamar and Barton Springs
- Look at the timing of the lights
- Look at the sign going eastbound where the bike lane ends approaching Barton Creek

Mr. LeBlanc seconds. There is no dissent. Mr. Faidley asks if the project was associated with a bond package. Ms. Beaudet responds that it was associated with the 2010 Bond package for \$750k. Mr. Jarnagin asks how better to communicate these plans with the public. Ms. Beaudet states that staff is working on putting a Facebook page together.

- Briefing: Mopac Mobility Improvement Project - Ms. Beaudet states that the largest portion of this project is the Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge over Barton Creek. She also states that City staff voluntarily complied with the City's environmental permitting process and that it meets 100% of City code, except for the amount of fill needed for the project; as reported last night to the Environmental Board. She stated that the fill portion of the project is a common variance. The City's Environmental Officer stated that the mitigation offered with the project is likely sufficient for a City recommendation for cut and fill over four feet to the Environmental Board, if this were a City of Austin project (which it is not). Ms. Gibbs asks if SOS has approved of the project. Ms. Beaudet responds that the City has been working with environmental groups for the past two years and has developed the design with the help of the environmental community. The next step is to finalize the environmental report in which they will finalize the foundation, then present the decision to TXDOT for approval. Mr. Cosper asks if the BAC will have a chance to weigh in on the foundation decision. Ms. Beaudet states that we could; staff is still going to a couple more meetings if they are interested in attending those, or staff could send the option to the BAC. Mr. Jones asks if the bridge is cantilevered. Ms. Beaudet explains the foundation options and states that she will send Mr. Cosper the link.

5. Announcements/Adjourn –

- Mr. Faidley Moves to adjourn and Mr. McFadden seconds