

CITY OF AUSTIN  
BICYCLE ADVISORY COUNCIL (BAC)  
MEETING SUMMARY

City Hall, Staff Bull Pen  
301 W. 2<sup>nd</sup>  
May 21, 2013  
6:00PM

PARTICIPANTS:

Allison Kaplan – BAC Chair  
Tommy Eden – BAC Vice Chair  
Nick Warrenchuk - BAC  
Mitchell Harrison – Alt BAC

Tom Thayer – BAC  
Noni Jarnagin – Alt BAC  
Eileen Nehme – BAC  
Ashley Hunter - BAC

Chris LeBlanc - BAC  
Tom Wald - Alt BAC  
Alan Garcia – Alt BAC

GUESTS:

Rich Hollenbeck

David Orr

Patrick Jones

STAFF PRESENT:

Nadia Barrera  
Nathan Wilkes

Annick Beaudet  
Lewis Leff

Chad Crager  
Aleksiina Chapman  
Shannon Wisner

1. Introductions – Ms. Kaplan begins the meeting with introductions
2. Review and Approval of April Minutes – Mr. LeBlanc made a motion to approve the minutes and Mr. Jarnagin seconded. The minutes are approved.
3. Items from BAC –
  - Briefing - 24-Hour Trail Pilot Project – Mr. Lewis Leff provides a handout and gives background on the purpose and development of the project. Mr. Wald states that the dissent he heard was regarding the cost of the enforcement budget needed. Mr. Leff responded that the first estimate involved full-time staff, maintenance equipment, and other additional resources. The response to the preliminary budget was to ask for only the necessary budget line items and limiting the policy to only cyclists. Mr. Leff expounds on the overall benefit of the policy discussion, future trail use, and the Urban Trails Master Plan. A citizen asks about the Park Ranger program. Mr. Leff clarifies that the main purpose of the Rangers is to provide some public safety, but they are not able to write citations as a law enforcement officer. Mr. Orr asks about what happened to the Park Rangers who were actually officers. Mr. Leff believes that those Rangers became absorbed into APD. The citizen asks why we couldn't just re-start the Park Ranger program. Mr. Jarnagin asks how the City will measure success of the pilot. Mr. Leff responds that Public Works staff has done preliminary counts. Additionally, APD will develop a better GIS reporting mechanism for trails. Mr. Jarnagin states that a response to this could be a call box. Mr. Leff states that a cell phone or other GPS device would be useful in this regard. Ms. Kaplan states that it was frustrating to see that pedestrians were removed from the policy. Mr. Leff responds that some of the concerns were regarding the homeless population living near the trails and using the parks at night. Mr. Sloan wants to know why it costs more to determine if the person is loitering or not. Mr.

Warrenchuk says that the policy allows them to address any citizen walking at night. Mr. LeBlanc states that the argument was such that allowing pedestrians to use the trail would take more time to enforce. Mr. Eden is concerned because putting a cost to the expanded patrols means that when we expand the project to other trails, it will cost more. The overall question is whether or not the additional funding is really necessary. Mr. Leff clarifies that the pilot was a mid-year budget amendment, which was the reason for the additional funding. Mr. LeBlanc would like to see the counts. Ms. Kaplan would like to know how this would be included in the Urban Trails Master Plan (UTMP). Ms. Beudet responds that it will be included as part of the policy analysis. Mr. Cospers would like to know how much funding is spent on enforcing the curfew now. Mr. Leff states that they have APD officers in the area, but they are not assigned specifically to the trails. Ms. Nehme would like to recommend that the BAC request some sort of evaluation. Mr. Warrenchuk reminds the group that waiting a month to provide a recommendation would also allow the group to ride on the trails at night. Ms. Nehme will think about parameters for evaluation and the item will be on next month's agenda.

- Briefing - LAB on 4<sup>th</sup> @ Waller – Mr. Crager states that Austin Energy has already added additional lighting in the area, but it does not point directly at the bridge. Therefore, the Bicycle Program is working to install bright, LED, solar lights along the bridge. The lights should be up before next month. Mr. Crager also states that Street & Bridge has closed the trail between 4<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> just west of Waller Creek. APD has also increased their enforcement at this location. A citizen asks about additional lights on other trails. Mr. Crager responds that illumination will be addressed as part of the UTMP. Mr. Warrenchuk would like to know about a flashing beacon crossing IH-35 frontages at the LAB. Mr. Wilkes responds that the Transportation Department is working with TXDOT to study the crossing.
- Briefing - Westgate Blvd – Ms. Beudet states that although the roadway is getting resurfaced, there is not an opportunity to add bicycle facilities. Ms. Kaplan asks if APD could target Westgate with their Vulnerable User Initiative. Ms. Barrera will coordinate with Officer Cunningham to inquire if that is a possibility. Mr. Wilkes states that he will look into sharrows and/or share the road signage for Westgate. Mr. Cospers asks about parking modifications for Berkeley. Mr. Cospers would also like to know about the auxiliary cycletrack on Manchaca. Ms. Beudet would like to propose some sort of incremental improvements to Westgate during our off-season in the fall. Mr. Jarnagin would like to see APD study aggressive driving along with the Vulnerable User Ordinance.
- Briefing - Koenig near Woodrow – earliest possible date for resurfacing is Summer 2015
- Briefing & Possible Action – Budget in a Box – Ms. Krause did not attend. Mr. Wald asks that the group provide input on the budget on-line.
- Briefing & Possible Action – North Mopac Bike/Ped Highway – Mr. Wald asks the BAC if they would like a formal feasibility study of a trail along the project. The scope of this project is from Lady Bird Lake to Parmer Lane. The BAC has seen some components, but not a formal feasibility study for the length of the project. Mr. Eden states that the BAC needs an official statement from the CTRMA regarding the feasibility of the trail. Mr.

LeBlanc states that the most important gap for him would be connecting over 183. Mr. Wald would like a motion:

The BAC requests that CTRMA complete a formal feasibility study for a shared use path from Enfield Road to the Parmer Lane along the Mopac corridor.

Ms. Hunter seconds and the motion passes.

- Briefing – Bike Maps – Ms. Kaplan updates the group that the BAC had a Technical Subcommittee meeting earlier in May regarding Mr. Kopper’s gap analysis. Ms. Kaplan would like to know when the bike map will reflect those changes. Ms. Barrera asks the group to send her a list of changes they would like to see on the map and states that the Bicycle Program will be targeting the end of the year for a new bike map. Mr. Jones asks if the legend for the map should be changed (low, medium, high comfort). Mr. Cospers would like to see advertisements on CapMetro buses or trains about the map. Perhaps the Bicycle Program could just have the map as an ad on transit. Ms. Beaudet will interact with Mr. Baraosky from CapMetro for more information. Mr. Garcia would like to see UT’s bicycle tools and service stations added to the map.
- Briefing & Possible Action – Bergstrom Expressway – Mr. Crager updates the group on the future 183 toll-way between 290 and 71. CTRMA has begun their environmental study and is looking at bicycle facilities along the corridor. Currently they have proposed an eastside 10’ shared use path and a 6’ shared use path on the west side. They are also proposing 5’ bike lanes in each direction. Mr. Crager asks if the group would prefer to keep the bike lanes or remove them. The frontage road widths cannot be changed. Mr. Wilkes states that during his communication he has asked for wider paths as opposed to bike lanes. They were asking for more space behind the curb, especially when cyclists often need to travel in two directions. Mr. Wald brings up the discussion of changing the facility from a shoulder to a bike lane by including a bike symbol. Mr. Eden would like to know about the number of curb cuts along the frontage roads, and how we plan to accommodate cyclists at those intersections. Ms. Nehme would like to know if there is any treatment the Bicycle Program could recommend to improve the bicycle lanes. Mr. Eden gives some background on the project. Mr. Camacho asks why CTRMA cannot narrow the road and widen the path. Mr. Crager states that the as far as he understands there will be a 10’ path on one side and a 5-10’ path on the other. Ms. Nehme asks about safety studies and speeds of 50mph. Mr. Bartle states that something more than a bike lane marking (rumble strip) would be preferable due to the speed.
  - Options:
    - Shoulder
    - Wide Curb Lane
    - Edge Stripes with rumble

- While the BAC would prefer a wider shared use path, given the available options a bike lane on the frontage road in addition to the shared use path would be acceptable. Facilitating a connection to the Airport is desirable.

4. Items from Staff:

5. Announcements:

- Next Technical Subcommittee Meeting June 20 regarding the cycletrack network.

6. Proposed Items From Staff for Future Meetings:

- Removal of curfew on the trails – pilot study (parameters for evaluation)
- Technical Subcommittee will report back to the BAC in June about Rainey St
- Pleasant Valley Road Diet
- Shared Lanes on 290 Expressway
- Enhancements Proposals – Traffic Signals for bicycles
- Bike Share

7. Mr. LeBlanc motions to adjourn and Ms. Hunter seconds.

DRAFT