

CITY OF AUSTIN
BICYCLE ADVISORY COUNCIL (BAC)
MEETING SUMMARY

Austin City Hall, Room 1029
301 W. 2nd
June 17, 2014
6:00 p.m.

PARTICIPANTS:

Mike Kase – BAC Chair
Christopher Stanton - BAC Vice Chair
Sophia Benner – BAC

David Orr – BAC
Tom Thayer – BAC
Pete Wall – Alt BAC

Tom Hilde – Alt BAC
Alison Kaplan – Alt BAC
Chris LeBlanc – Alt BAC

GUESTS:

Michael Cosper
Richard Mayness – Friends of Williamson Creek
Lt. Christian Malanka – APD

Chris Wilkinson
Matt Dietrichson – Movability Austin
John Woodley

Malcolm Yeatts – EROC
Peter Baird - PAC

STAFF PRESENT:

Aleksiina Chapman

Robert Anderson - PAC

Nadia Barrera

1. Introductions – Mr. Kase begins the meeting with introductions.
2. Review and Approval of May Minutes – **Mr. Stanton moves to approve the minutes with amendments. Mr. Orr seconds. No dissent. The minutes are approved.**
3. Items from BAC –

Briefing and Possible Action: Proposed Underpass of HWY 183 – Malcolm Yeatts

Mr. Yeatts introduces a proposal for an underpass at HWY 183 at the Colorado River.

Regarding the Brandt Lane connection, Mr. Kase clarifies that the trail connection is not City sanctioned. Mr. Yeatts said that it looks like people have been in specifically to chop down trees. The easement for the Brandt Lane connection already exists. Mr. Stanton asks who owns the property and Mr. Yeatts is not sure but thinks that there is a for sale sign on the property. Mr. Anderson asks if putting a trail through Brandt Lane could conflict with subdivision regulations and thinks that a street connection may be required if the lot redeveloped. Mr. Kase asks if a trail was to be put in now, if we could not just add bike lanes in addition to a street in the future. Ms. Chapman clarifies that there is no means to build this trail connection and that it is separate from the underpass discussion. Mr. Orr says that there was a discussion about shared use paths with the TxDOT 183 South project. Mr. Yeatts says that TxDOT is planning shared use paths along 183, but he would like to see the underpass in addition. The section east of 183 has roads that are great for riding because they are empty, flat, and are close to the

central city. Mr. Orr asks if the urban trails plan included a trail along the Colorado River. Mr. Yeatts confirms. Mr. Yeatts would like to accelerate construction so that it happens before the 183 project. Mr. Orr says that he thinks that the parks board might be a bigger battle than TxDOT. Mr. Stanton would say that he has no problem supporting this as an idea, but he thinks that it may not be feasible to construct in the near term. He would be surprised if this happened in 2 or 3 years because of the grade considerations. Ms. Kaplan thinks this idea requires more consideration. Mr. Leblanc would like to hear from Ms. Barrera and Mr. Wilkes before considering further motion. Mr. Thayer clarifies that the idea is that TxDOT will build the underpass. Mr. Yeatts confirms that that is the idea, but it could also potentially be built by the City of Austin. Mr. Kase would like to table this discussion until more information can be provided by city staff.

Briefing and Possible Action: Proposed Wording of BAC Bylaws Relating to Technical Subcommittees – Mike Kase

Mr. Kase introduces proposed bylaw changes relating to technical subcommittees. Mr. Kase discusses differences between both options presented: one wording suggests and appointment of a subcommittee organizer by the BAC chair and the other suggests an election. Ms. Kaplan prefers an appointment. Mr. Orr agrees. Mr. Kase sees that option two, electing a representative, presents a hold up while waiting for election cycle. Mr. Stanton prefers fewer elections.

Mr. Orr moves to adopt the wording presented in option (1). Mr. Stanton seconds. No dissent. Motion passes.

Briefing and Possible Action: Proposed Wording of BAC Bylaws Relating to Purpose – David Orr

Mr. Orr introduces a proposed bylaw re-wording of the purpose. Unlike the PAC bylaws, the BAC bylaws have no wording specifically advocating for bicycles. He would like to see it stated that this body advocates for cyclist safety and cyclist issues. Mr. Orr reads proposed changes. Ms. Kaplan thinks it's complicated. Mr. Kase is concerned that this body will be perceived as an advocacy organization instead of an advisory council of experts on the subject matter and thinks the BAC would be better served by the other advocacy groups bringing advocacy matters to the BAC's attention. Mr. Kase also doesn't think that the proposed wording changes are equitable with the advocacy intent since there is nothing about advocacy in the wording. The existing language implies objectiveness and Mr. Kase would like that to remain. Mr. Anderson points out that there is an absence in the existing wording of their role to advise the city to move forth in a different direction. Ms. Kaplan would rather keep it simple. Mr. Orr asks what the next step would be. Mr. Stanton asks what problem we are trying to solve and wonders if people are misconstruing the role of the BAC because of the existing wording. Mr. Orr thinks a wording change could help members do assigned duties better and that it could resist having a car oriented person on this body as the political climate changes. Mr. Kase points to the bylaws to say that all that is required from this meeting would be to agree upon the language and a vote would come down next month. Ms. Benner asks why this was brought to our attention.

Ms. Orr replies it was from reading over the PAC bylaws. Ms. Benner likes the idea of putting further thought into the BAC mission statement. Ms. Kaplan says that in her experience elections take care of extreme people since the BAC is voted on by the existing membership. Mr. Wall says in the past the BAC tried to become an official commission but chose to remain independent- meaning that City Council members do not appoint membership. Mr. Kase asks if there is a motion to accept Mr. Orr's wording. Mr. Kase suggests setting up a subcommittee.

4. Items from Staff –

Briefing and Possible Action: Land Development Code Recommendations – Robert Anderson

Mr. Anderson introduces the land development code rewrite and thanks the BAC for having him back.

Another draft of the land development code recommendations to the CodeNEXT team was sent out earlier this week. Mr. Stanton asks where these recommended changes will be enforced. Mr. Anderson said that they will be code requirements. The first step is to submit these recommendations and then next to continue to follow up and ensure that these recommendations float to the top. Mr. Cosper asks what the timeline is for code next. Mr. Anderson replies several years. There will be a Council check-in to proceed with the proposed approach in the near future but that it will be an iterative process with boards and commissions and Council. Mr. Mayness agrees that the addition about aligning with existing master plans is very important. Mr. Hilde thinks that we should use stronger wording and use shall instead of should. Ms. Kaplan struggles with endorsing the recommendations when the BAC did not write it. Mr. Kase does not understand her objection. Mr. Anderson says that this will point to sections of the code that don't work and suggest solutions for how it can be fixed. It is a platform to continue to be engaged over the next three years. Ms. Kaplan doesn't feel as if she has done her due diligence. Ms. Orr recognizes that this is a multi-year project and wonders about deferring, though recognizes that any lack of commitment is because of their own neglect. Mr. Anderson would prefer a vote on the subject. Ms. Benner says that many BAC members have been involved in this process and Ms. Benner is ready to make a resolution of support. Mr. Thayer has also read the recommendations and he thinks that they are solid recommendations. Mr. Kase agrees with Mr. Hilde on the wording and thinks that we could have stronger language.

Mr. Kase moves to support the recommendations to CodeNEXT with the addition of stronger language where appropriate. Mr. Thayer seconds. No dissent. Motion passes.

Briefing and Possible Action: Loop 360 Profile Pavement Markings – Aleksiina Chapman

Ms. Chapman brings the BAC up to date on the bike program's efforts in getting a test strip put down. 3M was an identified vendor but they no longer supplying the pavement markings as of recently. TxDOT is open to the idea of putting down pavement markings. Ms. Chapman asks if

the BAC still supports the idea. And if the BAC supports putting down profile pavement markings without having tested a test strip first. Mr. Stanton clarifies rumble strips vs. pavement markings – pavement markings are glued on top of the pavement and painted, rather than grooved into the pavement. Mr. Stanton recommends telling TxDOT to go ahead and put the pavement markings in, except for entrances and exits to Loop 360 and crossings.

Mr. Stanton proposes the following resolution:

The BAC supports the installment of profile pavement markings on Loop 360, except at entrances, exits and cross streets, and asks that the City of Austin Bicycle Program work with TxDOT on the identification and installment of the pavement markings. Mr. Thayer seconds. No dissention. Motion passes.

Mr. Stanton recognizes that the BAC no longer supports putting down a test strip.

Briefing and Possible Action: Urban Trails Master Plan – Nadia Barrera

Mr. Stanton gives an overview of the technical subcommittee. There was an issue with the trail at Norwood Park and there was a request for a trellis attachment to get people directly into the Norwood property. There was concern about the Williamson Creek trail and whether or not the neighborhood wanted it. Five levels of priorities were suggested instead of three. There was also a question about prioritization at the subcommittee. Mr. Yeatts want to make sure that the country club creek trail was still included. Ms. Barrera confirms. Mr. Mayness asks about reaching back out to other neighborhoods about their plans. Ms. Barrera says that she is not sure how they will proceed in that area.

Mr. Stanton recommends that the BAC supports the plan as is with the understanding that there will be a ranking system for trails incorporated into the plan. Mr. Thayer seconds. Motion passes.

5. Proposed Items for Future Meetings –

Distracted Driving/Bicycling/Walking Study Group Recommendations to Council – Sophia Benner

Ms. Benner introduces the topic. Mr. Wald previously sent out a link to the distracted walking and texting article. Ms. Benner thinks that the BAC could make recommendations as they pertain to distracted bicycling and perhaps call out that distracted walking/texting is not as dangerous and distracted driving. Ms. Benner thinks that equating distracted biking or walking to distracted driving is a gross underestimation of how dangerous texting while driving is and that the City should not be focusing any resources or efforts into preventing walking while texting or biking while texting. Ms. Leblanc asks if there would be any opposition to an overall ban on texting. Mr. Stanton would be opposed to an ordinance that says you can't use your phone while walking because there is already an ordinance that restricts you from walking out

into traffic and would consider distracted walking a low-risk venture when compared to distracted driving. Mr. Kase would entertain a discussion on the issue. Mr. Anderson mentions that the BAC may need to present to them. Mr. Kase thinks we need more information. Mr. Malanka doesn't think that the solution is another ordinance and that an educational campaign for driving out of designated lane would be more effective. It is easier to issue a citation based on the transportation code than on a hard-to-pin-down ordinance.

5. Announcements/Adjourn –

Mr. Stanton moves to adjourn. Mr. Thayer seconds. No dissent. Meeting is adjourned.