

CITY OF AUSTIN
BICYCLE ADVISORY COUNCIL (BAC)
MEETING SUMMARY

One Texas Center, 8th Floor Conference Room
301 W. 2nd
January 21, 2014
6:00PM

PARTICIPANTS:

Mike Kase – BAC Chair	Tom Thayer – BAC	Chris LeBlanc – Alt BAC
Christopher Stanton – BAC Vice Chair	Nick Warrenchuk – BAC	Tom Wald - Alt BAC
Tommy Eden – BAC	Eileen Nehme – BAC	Tom Hilde – Alt BAC
Sophia Benner – BAC	David Orr - BAC	Bill Blome – Alt BAC
Noni Jarnagin – Alt BAC	Pete Wall – Alt BAC	

GUESTS:

Michael Cospers	Dayton Crites	Jesse Duncan
Joel Meyer		Matt Beard

STAFF PRESENT:

Aleksiiina Chapman	Nadia Barrera	Doug Ballew
Nathan Wilkes		Shannon Wisner

1. Introductions – Mr. Kase begins the meeting with introductions
2. Review and Approval of December Minutes – Mr. Stanton moves to approve the minutes and Mr. Orr seconds. The minutes are approved.
3. Items from BAC –

Briefing and Possible Action: Bicycle Parking Standards – Mr. Stanton briefly describes the method of installing bicycle racks. Contractors tend to not deform the nuts sufficiently so as to frustrate theft. Mr. Stanton thinks that the detail should potentially include a security nut (conical nut with a sheer-away top). Mr. Orr mentions that if the bolt is not set well enough, it can be easily jarred when one goes to deform the threads. Mr. Stanton states that to use the security nuts, you have to set the bolts with the normal nuts and then replace with the security nuts. Mr. Stanton states that in particular of interest were the new racks on 4th Street near the Convention Center and the new racks on 5th Street. Mr. Eden asks if there could be better inspection. Mr. Wilkes states that the inspectors could be trained on how to check the racks to make sure the bolts have been deformed properly. Mr. Stanton will send staff a list of the products they use for the racks and staff will work to create a standard detail to be posted to the rules posting process. Staff will report back once the standard has been posted.

Briefing and Possible Action: Report from the Technical Subcommittee Meeting – Mr. Wald begins by outlining what was discussed in regards to the CAMPO 2040 Plan. The group discussed and prioritized projects. The group then discussed the IH-35 Project and looked at options for narrower right of way (ROW) situations and what would be the ideal for good bicycle and pedestrian connections. Additionally, the Project Team (HNTB) is limited to AASHTO and the design must be approved by FHWA. For example, the group decided that they would prefer a substandard shared use path to a shared lane.

Mr. Wilkes then uses visual tools to demonstrate bicycle and pedestrian facility options given the ROW available for the project. Mr. Eden asks about the cross section in regards to their length. He states that shorter segments can be addressed. Mr. Wilkes responds that the most common width of the ROW is approximately 20'-23'. Mr. Stanton clarifies that a preferred approach may be a handbook that lists by priority the cross-section by available ROW. Mr. Kase asks about the cost implication of changing the width of the roadway. Mr. Wilkes states that there is certainly an additional cost associated with the change. Mr. Wald asks if Mr. Wilkes would be able to create the list of prioritized cross sections. Mr. Wilkes states that he will. Mr. Orr asks if AASHTO would change their standard. Mr. Wilkes states that he is not sure if AASHTO would change; but, perhaps the FHWA may be willing to respond to the request from the local cycling community. Mr. Eden asks about intersections. Mr. Wilkes states that it will likely be curb cuts and ramps at intersections. Mr. Thayer states that realigning the radius of an intersection to slow turns may become the standard for this and other projects. Mr. Wald mentions minutes from the December meeting in which CM Riley stated that CAMPO policy accepts a wide curb lane as a bicycle facility; while many bicycle riders do not consider a wide curb lane an ideal bicycle facility. Mr. Myer mentions that a good approach to changing this policy is to attend the CAMPO Board Meetings to give feedback. Mr. Wald states that there will be a call for projects in the next three months. He states that a good approach would be to attend the meetings when those projects are up for review and request shoulders or shared use paths on a project by project basis. Mr. Wilkes discusses an order of magnitude project in which the protected bicycle network would be a feasible project; that would have similar cost and additional benefits as the Mopac Improvement Project. He will be submitting this project to model for the CAMPO 2040 Plan. The model will provide estimates on the effect of a protected bicycle network at build-out. Mr. Wilkes states that he will bring the toolbox of options to the BAC meeting next month.

4. Items from staff – 6:40-7:30

- Briefing and Possible Action:** South Lamar Development Assessment – Mr. Wilkes states that he has made some progress in that the City can require that trees are set back but, the curbs cannot be moved at this time, unless a street reconstruction is done. From Barton Springs to the Ann Richards School, only 13% of developments do not have sufficient ROW for the cycletrack. Given existing ROW and potential ROW, only 8% of the frontage road would need to be addressed. Mr. Wilkes states that one of the biggest constraint is to plan on a site by site basis. Mr. Wald asks about the opinion of the Planning Department. Mr. Wilkes states that there has been consensus that the ROW should be used for transportation purposes. Mr. Cooper asks when Manchaca will be resurfaced between Ben White and Lamar. Neither Mr. Wilkes nor Ms. Chapman are sure when Manchaca will be resurfaced. Ms. Nehme states that there will be a corridor study on S. Lamar and Guadalupe. She states that the BAC should offer recommendations at some point to the engineering firms working on those projects.
- Briefing and Possible Action:** Gullett-Lamar-Brentwood Update – Mr. Wilkes introduces the project. The plan would be to have sharrows on Romeria and a two-way trail on Arroyo Seco. The neighborhood just got a Neighborhood Partnering Program grant to include the trail. Romeria eventually extends to Denson, which connects directly to Airport Boulevard and the MetroRail station at Lamar and Airport Boulevard. The proposal includes closing the free right from Burnet to White Rock. In general, this improvement was well received. There is potential implementation funding due to the Burnet Road Improvement Project named in the 2012 Transportation Bond. Staff will pursue including these improvements in the bond project. In general, the complications are near Gullett. Due to adjacent parks and residential parking, there is high parking demand around the school. A cycletrack nearby would reduce parking by 50%. At

the meeting, there was strong dissent to removing parking in the area. The point was made that there are only two times a day and only during the school year that this facility is needed. Mr. Orr states that while that might be the case, helping children to safely ride their bicycles to school is the lowest common denominator. Mr. Stanton mentions that Shoal Creek and Great Northern both have substandard bicycle facilities. Mr. Stanton recommends a two-way cycletrack on the west side. Mr. Ballew states that if you build the facility, the children will start to ride and there will be less motor vehicle traffic. Mr. LeBlanc states that he would like to see the plan built out as discussed, but would also like to see Shoal Creek Boulevard improved and the improvements adjacent to Lamar. Mr. Wilkes also states that neither Treadwell nor Bullard are included in the Bicycle Master Plan and therefore, the Bicycle Program is not required to provide bicycle facilities on the roadways. Mr. Wald suggests a pilot project and or allowing for parking during the summer. Mr. Wilkes states that an option would be to restrict parking only during school hours. Mr. Wald asks about bike lanes as opposed to a cycletracks. Mr. Stanton mentions that Ghisallo is working with the school to have an after school program. Mr. LeBlanc asks how the project was left with the neighborhood. Mr. Wilkes is interested with the proposition for timed parking restrictions. Mr. Bloome suggests working with the school administration regarding a timed parking restriction. Mr. Wilkes prefers the approach of creating great bicycle facilities for those schools that can accommodate them and are willing to accommodate them. Ms. Nehme states that it seems as though going against the neighborhood will is not a good idea and there is no time sensitivity for this project. Mr. Wilkes states that there can be a third meeting with a balanced stakeholder group. Mr. Wald states that the BAC should pass a resolution to support bicycle facilities directly to schools, and recommends including those connections in the Bicycle Plan. Ms. Nehme seconds. The resolution passes with no dissent.

- **Briefing:** Bicycle Program 2014 – Staff gives a short update on the changes.

4. **Announcements/Adjourn –**

- Ms. Benner states that the Bicycle Film Festival is coming to town the last weekend of April. If anyone is interested in helping out or learning more, let her know.
- A group from the BAC went to the Traffic Management Center to learn more about dynamic traffic signals, loop sensors, and other signal-specific information. There is also the potential for use of Bluetooth technology to identify cut-through traffic.

Mr. LeBlanc motions to adjourn and Mr. Stanton seconds.