

**FINAL MEETING MINUTES of the
BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**May 10, 2010
6:00 PM**

**Community Room
215 N. Mason
Fort Collins, CO 80521**

FOR REFERENCE:

Chair: Rick Price	970-310-5238
Vice Chair: Cathy Mathis	970-
Staff Liaison: Kathleen Bracke	970-224-6140
Staff Support: Dave "DK" Kemp	970-416-2411

BOARD/CITY ORGANIZATION MEMBERS PRESENT

Bike Fort Collins: Jeff Morrell
Transportation Board: Bill Jenkins
UniverCity Connections: Rick Reider
Economic Advisory Commission: Rick Price
Fort Collins Bicycle Co-Op: Doug Cutter
Poudre School District: John Holcombe
Colorado State University: David Hansen
Downtown Development Authority: Kathy Cardona

AT LARGE MEMBERS PRESENT

Dan Gould
At Large: Cathy Mathis

ABSENT

Air Quality Board: Greg McMaster
Natural Resources Advisory Board: Clint Skutchan
Senior Advisory Board: Vacant
Parks and Recreation Board: Greg Miller
Lands Conservation and Stewardship Board: Chris Gaughan
At Large: Kim Sharpe

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

FCBikes Coordinator: Dave "DK" Kemp
City of Fort Collins: Joe Olson
City of Fort Collins, Transportation Planning & Special Projects Director: Kathleen Bracke
Transportation Planning Administrative Assistant: Gail Neben
Parks and Recreation Board: Dawn Theis
Former Greeley Open Space Foundation Member: Jeff Nosal

New Belgium Tour de Fat Director: Mike Graff

Call to order

Meeting called to order at 6:01 PM

Agenda review:

Rick Price reviewed the agenda. No comments or changes by the members.

Public Comments:

Jeff Nosal introduced himself to the BAC.

Approval of minutes:

Rick Price presented the meeting notes from April, 2010 meeting. The notes from Craig Foreman's presentation were given to the members. John Holcombe commented that the discussion on the Fort Collins Velodrome was not included in the minutes. Rick Price will ask Craig Foreman for information on this subject.

Dan Gould moved approval of the minutes with the addition of the notes from Craig Foreman. Cathy Mathis seconded. Motion carried.

Action items:

Plan Fort Collins Update (Kathleen Bracke):

Purpose of the presentation is to request feedback and comments from the BAC to submit to the Transportation Board regarding Plan Fort Collins Transportation Master Plan. A graphic of the overall process was presented with a graph of 'where we are now'. The last quarter's progress is included in the Snapshot report which includes lessons learned from the 1997 & 2004 Master Plans and new challenges and opportunities for the future. We are reviewing the Key Policy choices, funneling these down to a distinct set of choices, then defining the pros and cons and potential outcomes to determine the preferred direction to move forward. We will have the comments compiled and a report for the Bicycle Advisory Committee and Transportation Board in July prior to the City Council Worksession.

New change for Plan Fort Collins is using the City's Budgeting for Outcomes (BFO) for guidance in how the planning process is organized based on City Council guidance provided in March.

The Plan Fort Collins topics are: Economic Health, Environmental Resources, Community & Neighborhood Livability, Safety & Wellness, Culture, Parks & Recreation, Transportation, and High Performing Community. The new policy choices and direction will drive the analysis and implementation/action steps recommended by the plan.

Last time there was a traditional planning approach to the process to update City Plan and the Transportation Master Plan. This plan is a more iterative process based on interaction with the community and iterative analysis of land-use and transportation planning scenarios.

Discussion:

- Doug Cutter: How much should the ideas be funding based (based on limited funding)
- Dan Gould: Will the right-of-way base thresholds come up later?
- Kathleen: It has to do with the size of the different systems we choose.
- Dan G.: Would it have to do with different time points in acquiring Rights of way?
- Kathleen: The current master plan shows streets that may be built out or not. As development occurs we may set aside funds for future rights of way. Part of the decision making is whether we want to continue the practice of right of way preservations for future expansion. What is the physical impact in terms of size?

- The Transportation section of the Key Choices document begins on page 14 of the handout. These are the same topics discussed at the Boards and Commissions Special Workshop in April. Pages 14 & 15 have the Key Policy Choices. Funding options are included as a list of potential choices. To date, we are looking at a spectrum of choices that include all modes of transportation. How do we reshape our existing streets? It could be anything from adding bike lanes to “road diets.” How do we use the system to accommodate changing needs over time?

- It is important to share with the community that we cannot afford our existing transportation system. We are living beyond our means. Our traditional funding sources are declining and needs are increasing. Should we downsize the system to fit the resources that we have today? Nobody likes that choice but we thought it important to ask the question.
- Rick Reider: What alternate choices have you offered?
- Kathleen: Alternatives could be multiple choices addressed in the next queue of funding. But how do we resource it? How do we fund it?
- We have choices meant to represent both ends of the spectrum and choices in between. One end is to downsize and the other is to recommit to the current long range plans from the 2004 Master Plan or to go beyond that even more (all of the modal plans that we have in the Master Plan).
- Variations could be different modes or different geographic areas. Rather than blanket improvements we might focus on priority areas. Enhanced travel corridors with a district focus might be focused on a specific area of emphasis in districts: Downtown, Campus West, or the Harmony Corridor. We’re trying to look at this as a spectrum of choices. That’s why we’re seeking feedback.
- Do we have the right set of choices on this list or do we have some things missing? This is what I’d love to hear from you tonight. The choices are not meant to be mutually exclusive of the others. Some go hand in hand. How can we get more efficiency from the current system? Biking plays a huge role in this. Try not to choose which one(s) we like, at this point we’re just trying to get the right choices listed. Ex: Adjusting our level of services. Are there other options for funding? We might consider the amount of potholes we fill, frequency of sweeping or snow removal? Do we look at allocating our resources differently

- across the community? What is the spectrum of options, including funding options? Fees, taxes, special improvement districts, or anything else.
- Rick Reider: Do we know as a community where all these trips are coming from and going to and who is making them? For example. When you look at all the transportation I imagine a lot of the trips might be parents taking kids to school. A lot of the trips might be people going to work or going shopping. Is there a basket of goods that tells us what all those trips are made of?
 - Kathleen: Yes, we have several tools. Models outline trip patterns and changes over time are available from North Front Range Metropolitan Planning Organization (NFRMPO) and our City's Travel Demand Model. We have a travel demand model to analyze auto, transit, bike and pedestrian trips. NFRMPO has just conducted a household survey asking people about how they travel and where and this data is used along with the modeling to help guide our analysis. So we have regional and local data separated by mode split. It's a helpful tool, though modeling is not a magic answer. But it helps. And you can model different scenarios. If we had this land use, what would the trips look like? With different land use or with transit, what would the pattern look like?
 - Rick Reider: To clarify, our revenue is declining but demand is increasing. Where is that increased demand coming from? Are people driving more? Or they need to move about more? Or is it population?
 - Kathleen: As the population grows, people are driving, walking, cycling, or using transit more, and this is a trend over time. Transportation revenues are provided by funding such as vehicle registration fees and gas taxes. As the economy declines and prices increase, people purchase fewer cars and less gas, and that means less revenue. There is a host of issues going on affecting our revenue stream at the state, national and local levels.
 - Transition to the list of key messages heard from the Boards and Commissions Special Workshop are on the handout.
 - Desired input is in answer to the questions "do we have the right list of choices for policy and funding for the May 25 Council work session?" We'll be going back to Council in July to share the analysis of the different choices after the May 25th work session.

Rick Price invited Doug Cutter to submit the Bike Co-op's comments on the issue based on their "listening sessions."

Doug Cutter presented the Bike Coop summary of comments from eight public sessions for input into the Bike Plan and City Plan. Those comments were submitted in writing and are reproduced here:

“Final Report: Bike Co-op Listening Sessions Related to Plan Fort Collins, May 1010

The Bike Co-op held its final listening session Wednesday, May 5th. This meeting served to summarize citizens' comments made during eight previous sessions held throughout

the City and to prioritize action items for referral to City Planners, Transportation Planners and citizen's boards and commissions.

There was unanimous consent to offer the following recommendation:

“The community should take steps to improve bicycle safety and efficiency through a comprehensive bicycle safety education program and through enhanced engineering efforts. The education should target motorists, cyclist, K-12 children, and CSU students while the engineering enhancements should include:

1. The creation of bicycle boulevards (like Vine, Swallow, Stover, Canyon, Stuart, etc.) for efficient long distance movement of bikes between and among “activity centers,” across town and between existing corridors, including the Mason Trail, the Powerline Trail, the Poudre Trail and the Spring Creek Trail;
2. Installation of additional signal actuation devices at stop lights, including the use of default modes to facilitate bicycle travel;
3. The use of sharrows (shared lane arrows) and improved “Share the Road” signs that include the secondary sign “Bikes use full lane.”

The group reviewed the list of 120 items from the previous meetings and prioritized seventeen items (in random order):

- More grade separated crossings at intersections and along major trails;
- “Share-the-Road” signs should include “Bikes Use Full Lane” secondary sign;
- Increase bike/ped accessibility on and across College in “mid-town;”
- Add/improve bicycle lanes along North Shields, North College, Gregory, Lemay and others;
- Decrease speed limits near campus to 25 mph;
- Add “scramble intersections” (also called diagonal crossings and nicknamed the “Barnes Dance”) for Henry Barnes, an innovative traffic engineer at College and Mountain, Laurel and College, and Shields and Elizabeth for bikes and pedestrians;
- Add lighting on trails for safety (including use of motion detectors with lights);
- Make broader use of sharrows now that they are approved by the MUTCD (Manual on Uniform Traffic Code Devices);
- Utilize more PR campaigns such as the “Coexist” campaign;
- Target scofflaw cyclists for education;
- Improve east-west access to, from and between the Mason and Powerline trails;
- Enforce laws consistently;
- Create more bicycle boulevards;
- Improve signal actuation for bicycles or have signals default to green for cyclists;
- Educate motorists about the rights of cyclists and the benefits of bicycling;
- Educate K-12 children on bicycle safety;
- Educate CSU students on bicycle safety;”

END OF BIKE CO-OP RECOMMENDATION

Discussion continues:

Cutter: The one key issue that came up was safety. Not just education of motorists, but more broad based like talking to cyclists, motorists, K-12 students and CSU students who are key audiences that we want to educate.

Among other issues, the highest priority in the short term was to improve signal actuation. We have deployed some, but not all corridors are covered for bike actuation for traffic signals. There is a list on the handout (appended at the end of these minutes). We took nominations from the 120 ideas that we collected. We extracted the top 17 priorities to focus on. Our organization as the BAC needs to take this as early public input where it is not usually available. The Co-op did this to provide an early opportunity for public input. Now that we have this input we can continue to collect more but we need to make sure this is forwarded on to Council.

Discussion:

- Rick Price: In the first set of bullet points that Kathleen provide on Plan Fort Collins the Transportation list of “new or enhanced vision ideas” from Plan Fort Collins have several bullet points that refer to some of these ideas: “should some streets vary in emphasis, e.g. to favor bikes?” That sounds like a bike boulevard. Slower speeds and so on. Further down, “be daring to try some different ideas that might be better.” Or “getting across town with alternative modes doesn’t really work. Some places have bike lanes or sidewalks, but it’s not really a city-wide system.” That theme came out big time in our listening sessions and is central to the recommendation of the Bike Co-op that some of those streets – Stover, Swallow – and there are a number of others – Columbia – that, if you start thinking about them, if they could be configured through traffic engineering and planning . . . I don’t know, do we dare say, “bicycles yield and cars stop” on some of those so they do encourage people to ride their bikes? The cost and lack of grade separated crossings on the Mason Trail or the Powerline Trail: we heard from some people that this inhibits them from using the trails to commute. They would rather be on Meadowlark and Centre if they are headed to the University because they can sail through the lights if they get them right. So an aggressive consideration of some of these recommendations.
- Consideration of these fits nicely with the key policy questions suggestions coming forward.
- Dan Gould: I suggest that the concept of reshaping existing streets captures a lot of different possibilities about how we could adapt to more mixed mode situations with an emphasis of level of services that doesn’t necessarily prioritize motor vehicles that dealing with mismatch between safety and threat modes. It would be good if we could fill that in with some useful concepts to move in that direction. We would cover a lot of territory. Also to get in the idea of safety, encouragement and safety education – fits into vehicle alternatives. We are now in a ‘survive

- Fort Collins' mode, not Plan Fort Collins. I recommend not downsizing. All those other bullet points fit into the ultimate plan knowing that we are going to have some lean times. That means we should adjust our timeline.
- Doug Cutter: Are decisions going to be made because there is no funding source available in the foreseeable future to deal with the projected costs? That is short sighted. Are we setting aggressive enough goals or are we limiting ourselves? If the funding shows up, our large goal ideas will be ready.
 - Rick Price: That is how the Bike Plan has been handled. When opportunities come open for funding we need to have plans in place. Dan do you have examples of reshaping existing streets?
 - Dan Gould: Mountain Avenue is an example. What capacity was needed for motor vehicles? Four lanes – two lanes in each direction weren't needed so two were eliminated and bike lanes put in.
 - Rick Price: A road diet on Remington is an example. Laurel is another. We will talk later about Share the Road signs. Apparently the traffic engineers considered a road diet on Shields, north of Laurel with 2 lanes and bike lanes but no parking. That would be a great enhancement and downsizing. Another complaint area is Lincoln which is scheduled to be a 4 lane arterial. It could be downsized for bike lanes. This might be ideal for the suggestions we are hearing.
 - Kathleen: What we'd like to do here is a selection of different scenarios given the revenues that we have over time. It is also important to consider trails for transportation, not just recreation. Ideas for trails would be very helpful.
 - Dan Gould: At the Boards and Commissions Workshop people felt that more commuting on trails would be more incompatible with recreational use. Maybe commuter routes should be on roads. So we should reshape existing streets, not recreation trails.
 - Kathleen: There is a classification system for streets in the master streets plan, but not for trails. A trail is a trail whether it is a neighborhood connector or a major "arterial." Should we have a different gradation of trails? Like "arterial" trails vs. "collector" or "neighborhood" trails? Should we have different design standards for different types of trails? Maybe we can't just put everyone on the same 8' or 10' trail.
 - Rick Reider: Are you getting good input from CSU with this plan since so many students, faculty and staff are commuters?
 - Kathleen: I would say it is fair. We try to reach all ages through different media such as web, Facebook, Twitter, etc. We don't get a lot of University students come to our meetings. We also have presentations to CSU staff so their master plans are in sync with ours. It is challenging group to reach. We are also trying to reach seniors and youth in elementary schools. We are trying to get broad-based input.
 - The transportation board added a point to our list: the example was "what if we did increase the number of trails?" What if we considered improvements beyond what the plan shows. What do you all think about that?
 - Rick Price: We have a recommendation from the Bike Coop that addresses a lot of the bullet points and ideas that have come up here. There is room to change this but I would entertain a motion to adopt the Bike Coop recommendations?

- Rick Reider: There's nothing in there about the League of American Bicyclists. Should we continue to promote that in this type of document?
- Rick Price: Almost any educational initiative that we undertake whether it is kids or CSU is going to include LAB curricula so I think that would not be necessary here, though we should keep it on the table. This is more about engineering issues.
- Cathy Mathis moved that the BAC adopt the Bike Coop recommendations and pass them on to the Transportation Board and City Council as it is in the entire 2 page report.
- Doug Cutter: Second.
- Jeff Morrell: How much of the Coop recommendations are in the Bike Plan?
- Rick Price: Probably a lot of them. Some are but others are not included.
- Jeff Morrell: Signal actuation is in the plan.
- Rick Price: It's been there forever.
- Kathleen Bracke: There were no suggestions about funding in the Co-op plan.
- Dan Gould: I have a comment in this regard.
- Rick Price asked for further discussion; there was none. A vote was taken on the entire recommendation from the Co-op. **Motion carried unanimously to adopt the Bike Co-op recommendations as presented (see above).**

- Rick Price: Dan, do you want to comment on funding.
- Dan Gould: This should be more high-altitude, not just a laundry list of bike issues. This has to do with a policy that fosters economics, community and sustainability. I want to point out that Transportation in Fort Collins is wasting money by supporting two cars in every household. That cost is out of pocket costs of over \$500,000,000 per year. I would like some way this plan could capture a more economical and sustainable transportation system; a system that saves money and gains more mobility. That could be done by emphasizing bicycling, walking and transit. We could get all those for a fraction of that \$500M per year. And avoid those households having to support the cost of those cars. This calls for voluntarily redirecting household funds through some other medium than sales taxes that fluctuates, or gasoline tax. It could be a property based tax or a utility tax that would support the whole system. This would involve rethinking the transportation system as a basic utility as we do water, electricity, etc. I'd like to put in a plug for developing that coming from the bicycle community.
- Dawn Theis: Does transportation money transfer to different departments for different uses such as for trails?
- Kathleen: That's one of the questions. What would the implications be to transfer funds? There are typically two types of funding sources. This would be a paradigm shift. Trails have historically been paid for by non-transportation funding sources such as Great Outdoors Colorado, and transportation facilities (bike lanes, streets, etc.) are funded through traditional transportation sources such as vehicle registration fees and gas taxes. Question is how to have more flexibility on funds used for trails with a transportation focus? New sources and/or more flexibility to spend funds on different types of transportation needs.

- Rick Price: The funding from Washington D.C. looks good for bicycling in the next transportation package.
- Kathleen: While that is likely to be the case, the federal and state funding is typically for capital construction costs. An important local issue is the cost for operating and maintaining the system after it is built. O&M becomes our local responsibility. We need funding that can be flexible over time to build and operate/maintain our transportation system.
- Doug Cutter: Do we have the operations budget from the past? It would be helpful to give the cost per household. The presentation from Dan was helpful.
- Kathleen: I can provide that information for you. Dan, the presentation you gave at the Transit Finance Committee was very useful.
- Rick Price: This can be discussed at another meeting. If there is no more input, we will go to the next agenda item.

Discussion/Informational Items

Building on Basics (BOB) Bicycle Plan Funds Update:

Rick Price: Can you describe to us at what point the BAC will be invited to comment on the allocation of BOB funds.

Update: The BOB Bike Plan funding was approved by the voters and provides \$125K/year for bike improvements based on the 1998 bike plan. An annual selection process is used to determine projects each year with a joint team at the City including Transportation Planning, Engineering, Traffic Operations, PSD is involved, and also CSU. We take input for project ideas from the Bike Plan; also from community input over the years. As we move forward we have identified projects through 2011 so next selections will be made for 2012 funding. In 2011 we will come back to the BAC as part of the project selection process. The price tag for many of the bike projects on the list is very expensive so finding projects to fit the available \$125K per year can be challenging. We've done a variety of projects over the years. Sometimes the annual funding is used as local matching funds for larger grant funded projects. It has to be used for capital funding: signing and striping, equipment, technology, etc. We will come to the BAC in 2011 for input on the project list for 2012.

- Rick Price: Will you come to us for the 2011-12 Budgeting for Outcomes process? What BOB Bike projects are selected for 2011?
- Kathleen: right now we are waiting for directions from the City's Finance department to follow for the public outreach process for BFO and will follow-up with the BAC when we have more information.
- 2011 BOB Bicycle Plan funds have been directed as part of the City's local matching funds toward the Natural Resources Research Center/Whole Foods grade separated crossing project that the City is building in connection with the Mason BRT project.
- Jeff Morrell: When will the 2012 project selection process take place?
- Kathleen: In July 2011, we will begin the process for the following year.
- David Hansen: It seems like some of the BOB funding would tie in nicely with this plan from the Co-op.

- Rick Price: Is there still \$25K left unspent from 2009?
- Kathleen: Yes.
- Rick Price: Not spent and not allocated, correct?
- Kathleen: When the bids are in for the NRRC/Whole Foods project, they will decide if they need this funding or not. If that project doesn't need all of the funding, then it could be available for other projects.
- Rick Price: According to Diane Jones in the paper this morning, we are getting bids from 25-50% lower than usual.
- Kathleen: We can bring this back to BAC when we have more information.
- DK: Just to reiterate, BOB funds are to be used only for capital projects.
- Rick Price: We heard that already, thank you.
- David Hansen: Can this money be pulled out and reallocated if left?
- Kathleen: Yes, if bids are low and they don't need the funding, it will go back into the respective bike or pedestrian pots respectively. It would be a happy day if the bids come in low. And we would come back for your input.
- John Holcombe: Should it be a priority to have input on the BOB funds?
- Doug Cutter: what is the deadline to spend the 2009 funds?
- Kathleen: Capital funds do roll over. If funds are available we are glad to come back to BAC for input.
- Rick Price: For the record, we are interested in the allocation of BOB funds. The last time we heard about BOB fund allocations it was basically a done deal for the overpass at the Natural Resource Campus.
- John Holcombe: I think that should be a priority: that this group have input on BOB.
- Doug Cutter: Is there a deadline on spending the 2009 funds?
Kathleen: No, since capital funds roll over.
- Rick Price: Can we have assurance from staff that those monies won't be spent without coming to us for our opinion?
- Kathleen: From the staff liaison perspective I can assure you that if there are any remaining funds available we will be glad to come back and discuss that with the group.
- Rick Price: So his \$25K from 2009 is in that category?
Kathleen: Whatever it turns out to be.
- Doug Cutter: Is there any reason we shouldn't figure out what to spend that on? That way we're ready when the money becomes available.
- Rick Price: I'd love to see a workgroup to bring recommendations to BAC?
- Kathleen: The ballot says the project funds must be spent to implement the City's bicycle plan so that is important to keep in mind.
- Rick Price: We can ask for bike plan related and capital plans. Who wants to be on a group to make a recommendation? Note that Council has already asked staff to consider using those funds to build a Bike Safety Town somewhere. That could be used for bicycle education. Let Rick know if you are interested. (No response.)

Joe Olson Presentation: Requesting in put on bike lane signs per Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) changes (Joe Olsen)

There is an issue in Traffic Operations that could impact BAC. The FHWA made some changes in the regulations on the retro-reflectivity level of warning & regulatory signs. Our current signs do not meet these new requirements. We have a Sign Replacement program to be completed by 2014. The bike lane signs are regulatory and come under this program. In Fort Collins, there are 967 total bike lane signs that have a special design (including the FC Bikes logo). To replace these signs is will cost \$36 each for a total of about \$35,000 to change them all to meet the new FHWA requirement. The standard bike lane sign in the manual costs only \$21 each, for a total of \$21,000. The City could save \$15,000 if we use the standard bike lane signs instead of the current special FC Bike, bike lane signs. We do not have the funds to replace the current sign design. We would like input from BAC before we move forward. Both signs are roughly the same size.

Discussion:

- Rick Reider: It seems silly not to save the money.
- Kathleen: The old signs were designed by the City and approved by FHWA in mid 1990's as part of an education program of bringing about biking in Fort Collins. It was part of the branding, education, and a unique identity to the Fort Collins bike system. The City went through an extensive process through the Federal Highways to approve the current signs. It was the City's goal to have a more unique sign for our community than just the standard regulatory signs at the time. The goal was to have the signs be a part of the information system.
- Jeff Morrell: Are the current signs compliant?
- Joe: No. They aren't bright enough. We have to replace them.
- Jeff Morrell: Branding is important to Fort Collins
- Rick Price: I think the branding is important but I like the bigger sign.(signs are same size)
- DK: The logo is out of date.
- Joe: If we redo the logo then we would have to redo the process for approval by FHWA.
- Jeff Morrell: What is the timeline?
- Joe: 2014 to complete.
- Jeff: How much time does it take to go through the approval process?
- Rick Price: I am all for branding and marketing Fort Collins as a bicycle community but that is a different conversation. Bike friendly signs should be everywhere; let's take the branding message to merchants and everywhere. 967 new signs with that bicycle are great for branding, but FC Bikes is not the message.
- Rick Reider: The new one stands out more.
- Rick Price: That's my point.
- Jeff Morrell: To enhance the brand is beneficial.
- Rick Price: I am ok with the new signs being standard. DK should work on the branding and our image as a bike town.
- Dawn Theis: If you do that you are probably going to have increased costs.

- Rick Price: Yes, but that's a different pocket. That's not Joe's sign budget, that's DK's encouragement budget.
- Kathleen: It all comes out of the same pocket eventually of the City.
- Rick Price: But the CMAQ monies are a different pocket that funds DK's budget.
- Rick Reider: The Federal process is required to get another sign approved; do we want to create a committee to design it would cost more money.
- John Holcomb: Should we vote on Joe's recommendation?
- Doug Cutter: Is there a deadline to be compliant?
Joe: Yes, 2014.
- Dawn Theis: Where would the savings go?
- Joe: If we go with the cheaper signs, it means we can place more other types of regulatory or warning signs.
- Dawn Theis: Is it worth \$15K for the branding?

Rick Reider made a motion to approve Joe's recommendation for \$21 per sign with the standard design and approved reflectivity.

- Rick Price: Any discussion?
- John Holcomb: Are any share the road signs connected to these on the same poles?
- Joe: No. Share the road is considered a warning sign. They have to have the same reflectivity.

Rick Price called for a vote and the motion passed unanimously.

Report:

Share the Road Signs (Rick Price)

Cathy Mathis chaired the meeting while Rick Price gave the report.

A working group included me (Price), Dan Gould, John Holcombe and DK.

We looked at MUTCD (Manual on Uniform Traffic Code Devices).

In certain places Share the Road signs are recommended. Most signs in town follow that recommendation. 35 signs went up after a bike town meeting hosted by Bike Fort Collins in November 2007. We came up with a dozen places for STR signs. They went up without almost any time wasted by the end of summer 2008. We had signs go up on places like Riverside or Prospect east of College where just a few people proposed them.

Our working group questioned whether we should rethink signs in some of these places. For the record, the locations nominated in the Nov. 2007 meeting were:

- 1) Horsetooth (Stanford to across College);
- 2) Laurel (Remington to Howes); we solved that by eliminating parking on Laurel except right each side of College;
- 3) Shields north of Laurel. And according to DK who did some research on this, traffic Engineering considered a road diet and making bike lanes here. But they dropped that idea.
- 4) We discussed Old Town: Mountain Avenue, Magnolia, Oak and Olive and all those that cross College and in Old Town where bike lanes are involved. Dan is

a proponent of share the road signs where there is diagonal parking but not where there is none.

We researched where signs should go and a version of sign to recommend.

The working group has the following questions for the BAC:

- 1) Should we finalize a report and submit it to BAC formally with a recommendation? We have looked at some areas of Fort Collins, but not all of them.
- 2) Or, would the BAC like to pick this up and take look at the entire town to consider placement of Share the Road signs? We can provide you with a map and current guidelines from the MUTCD.
 - Jeff Morrell: Can we send an email to our lists asking for volunteers to give their opinion on areas where they ride?
 - Rick Price: So, turn to the community? We can do that and provide guidelines to the community. Joe, any comment?
 - Joe: We are not looking to use these signs as an advocacy or educational tool. We use them for areas with unusual conditions and as warning signs. We can't just place signs out where somebody wants them. I urge caution to invite people to place them where they want them.
 - Rick Price: Joe, do you have any comment on the signs that went up on East Prospect?
Joe: No, I haven't looked at them in detail.
 - Dan Gould: We can discuss more when we have more time. My opinion in places like E. Prospect is that use of the signs is a tacit endorsement of that as a place to use a bike. I don't think that is appropriate. There are no escape routes. It is a very hostile bike environment. Maybe there are places where we should not place these signs.
 - John Holcomb: There might be places in your notebook where signs would be more appropriate.
 - Dan Gould: In the past when we've considered places like this we have encouraged alternate routes. There is not money to make these places more bike friendly. The more fundamental approach is to make the bikers safe. Not to assert cyclists rights.
 - Rick Price: You have the same position on Shields north of Laurel, right?
 - Dan Gould: Yes, though it is not as bad as Prospect.
 - DK: Riverside?
 - Dan Gould: Parts of Riverside.
 - Jeff Morrell: Mulberry.
 - DK: Those are really our three hostile streets.
 - Rick Price: I will draft something for you to share with your groups.
 - Rick Reider: Is this City only or also the County?
 - Rick Price: We can't put signs in the County, can we Kathleen? But we can express an opinion.
 - Kathleen: Yes. I would ask that Joe help review what goes out. The letter that goes out from the BAC needs to be written so that it does not raise false community expectations that signs could go anywhere. That is Joe Olson's

- decision as the City Traffic Engineer. Joe should have the opportunity to review Rick Price's memo before it goes out the BAC and community.
- Rick Price: Joe, can you work with me on this?
 - Joe: Thank you. Yes we need to be careful. I'd be happy to.
 - Bill Jenkins: The current "Bikes Use Full Lane" signs from Rick are not appropriate for all places.
 - Joe: We can't use this sign yet as the 2009 Draft MUTCD guidelines have not yet been adopted in Colorado. But will by July, probably.
 - Rick: I don't expect that we are going to move that fast.
 - Joe: Thank you Joe for coming in.

Reports:

Staff Report: CSU Bike Forum & Bike Safety Education Plan (DK)

CSU has a campus Bicycle Advisory Committee that was formed under the auspices of the UniverCity Connections transit and mobility task force. It started in 2009 I think, or 2008 when we started putting together CSU bike summit meetings. They were really catching on, we were accomplishing a lot, understanding who our demographics were, putting ideas to the table and bringing all the Departments at CSU together to talk bikes everybody on board with teaching the same information and trying to go for the same results. We had CSU PD, Housing and Dining Services, Hartshorn Health Center, Bike Fort Collins, the Bike Co-op is there.

- Rick Price: Who represents the Bike Co-op?
- DK: It's Anthony Denardo. There's a lot more in the Ride Guide that just came out today. Comprehensive perspective of what's going on with cycling in Fort Collins and it's got a nice story on the campus bike advisory committee.
- Rick Price: Can you tell us what the goals or the focus or the results are that this group is looking for 'cause I think that this is the first time the BAC has heard about this forum, or am I wrong?
- DK: Yes, it's really coming together. We are really working on getting the status approved or recognized at CSU.
- David Hansen: CSU is trying to create a committee that is seen, from a validity standpoint, from the hierarchy of the University. So we had to go through this first phase of meetings to generate a game plan and then go to administration to present it. We are at that point with the administration to gain that validity.
- Rick Price: Is ASCSU a part of this group?
- David Hansen: Yes.
- Rick Price: And have you set any mission statement or goals?
DK: Yes. We have that.
- Rick Price: Am I the only one who is interested in hearing more about this? We always hear about CSU students being a major focus of concern for bike safety, scofflaws and so on. It would be useful for this group to hear about what's going on over there and what our City Bike Coordinator is working on in this respect. Can we get something in writing that documents this?
- DK: Yes, there's something in The Ride Guide.

- Rick Price: Is that a marketing piece for the general public or is it something that this group can actually make use of?
- DK: It's an education piece.
- Kathleen: Do you think it would be helpful to come and give an update to this group? Is it easier to do something in writing? I'm trying to figure out what would work best for CSU.
- DK: Right now we have a number of members sitting on the BAC. David, Rick Reider, Jeff Morrell, myself.
- Rick Price: Let me express a little frustration for having to read about this in the popular press. We should have more formal information about this organization as a bicycle advisory committee whose responsibility is to implement the City Bike Plan. If I'm wrong on that please say so.
- David Hansen: I'll speak to that. We couldn't come to you and present this without having the validity of having an actual group. The University is now at the point of recognizing the group so we can come to you and say, "We've formally created this so here we go."
- Rick Price: Thank you. Back to the BAC. Do you want a formal presentation or information to start with.
- Dan Gould: I have interest in this and would like to see it successful. A progress report might be in order.
- Rick Price: We can put it on the June agenda. Who would do that? DK and David can give a presentation. 30 minutes will be allotted and Cathy will chair since I will be gone. Are there any founding documents for this group? Surely you've told the University what you are doing and what you will do in writing. It would be useful for this group to see that so we don't have go over everything. So we can have a dialog.
- Jeff Morrell: That's doable.

Bicycle Safety Education Plan:

- Rick Price: The Bicycle Safety Education Plan
- DK: We'd like to have it done this year. Utilizing the strength of our partners, BPEC, for example – the Bicycle Pedestrian Education Coalition – providing input. Once we put a draft together we will bring it to the BAC at some point. We also have a Council work session scheduled in August.
- Kathleen: The Bike Ed plan is actually scheduled for this group in on the six-month planning calendar in either June or July. Before it goes to Council in August. Staff is leading this and the plan is just now being developed. Matt Wempe will provide an update in June or July.
- Rick Price: Is it ok with the group to put this on the July agenda? (no objections) We're talking input well before your plan is along so we have some input on how it unfolds.
- Kathleen: Correct, this will be brought to you several times during the writing of the plan, including key milestones including early on about the plan outline, then what the vision, mission, objectives and recommendations might be. Matt has laid out a series of deadlines in coming to the BAC.
- Rick: I'll make a note to put this on the July agenda. Thank you, DK.

Board Member Reports/Comments

Dan Gould: I would like to comment to follow up on the last meeting: the matter of getting feedback on serious bike crashes. It seems like we read about the crashes in the press with a vague idea of circumstances but there is little mention of the various factors that might have some teaching value. I have appointed myself a committee of one to look at how that might be done: given our present analyzing crashes geographically and categorically. I got some reports from the State Patrol. They are done by FCPD or State Patrol. Reports are available locally but not from the county. Reports are short of analysis that would be helpful. I got information on bike crashes but I want to talk to Joe about his reports he has seen and see if Police Services might be interested in looking at how this is reported.

Rick Price: Can we put this down as a standing sub-committee? You don't have to report every time but at least we are reminded if it is on our agenda.

Dan Gould: Yes.

Share the Road/BPEC: Rick Price

Share the Road: BPEC is not here but I'll report on the Bike Co-op involvement with the State Safe Routes to School Network. This is funded by Robert J. Woods Foundation. The group is forming and working on a work plan. I have been to meetings and the group is developing a 9-point work plan that includes Fort Collins with us identifying a bike safety curriculum to make available to all of the state. CDOT has issued a contract under Safe Routes to School to write a curriculum for this. It is not a broad program and it is specific to all classroom work, including art, social studies, etc. We are a part of this because our SRTS grant, administered by BPEC allocates money to identify and deploy a curriculum. At the end of the year we can judge the quality of the program with local teachers.

New Business/Future Agenda items:

The process for deciding agenda items will be dropped for now.

Chair's request to change BAC description on Agenda:

The chair requests a change in the description at the bottom of the agenda. I suggest using a part of the letter from Darin Atteberry which is a letter of charge to the committee:

(Price reads the following aloud).

“The BAC is a citizen's advisory committee which will provide recommendations to the Transportation Board on all bicycle related issues. . . . The Committee's actions will focus on the following functions:

1. Act as a liaison between the City and the community and community groups on issues related to bicycling.
2. Foster the interchange of ideas from existing City Boards and Commissions, as well as other community stakeholders, such as Poudre School District, Colorado State University, and the Downtown Development Authority, and others as appropriate.
3. Promote bicycling as a viable form of sensible transportation.
4. Act as a sounding board for citizens who have bicycle-related questions and concerns.

5. Assist in the development and dissemination of bicycle safety awareness and education and encouragement materials to the community.
6. Develop implementation strategies for recommendation in the 2008 Bike Plan.
7. Assist with the development of evaluation metrics for determining the success of bicycle programs and facilities.”

Letter from Darin Atteberry, City Manager, March 9, 2009

Would BAC like this as a task list? Or, are you satisfied with the mission statement drafted by Dan Gould? I like the bullet points as a reminder or a call back to where we are going. Any comments?

Discussion:

- Dan Gould: I like the present one better. It is shorter and to the point.
- Doug Cutter: I like the check list.
- John Holcomb: I like the check list.
- Kathy Cardona: I suggest we leave the mission statement as is and put the bullets on the back of our name tags.
- Jeff Morrell and Cathy Mathis are with Dan on this.
- Rick Price: Can we have a vote?
- John Holcomb: Length is a key factor. How long would it be? I would like less paper. Can we put more information in the PowerPoints and send electronically?
- Kathleen: We prefer electronic.
- Rick Price: Can we connect the PowerPoint to the minutes online?
- Kathleen: We can put it all on the web in meetings notes and a link to the documents.
- Rick Price: I will request staff to put bullets on the names tags.

Other Business:

Rick Price: Anything on the Bike Library? DK, how's the CSU Bike Library situation?

DK: It is looking pretty good there.

Rick Price: I would like to advise the group that I have been in touch with the City Attorney's office regarding two potential conflicts of interest. I am the Bike Safety Coordinator for the Bike Co-op and receive a salary or may in future. The head of the Transportation Board suggested that I may have a conflict of interest issue since the Bike Co-op is involved with City bicycle safety programs. The attorney says there is no conflict of interest because the Bike Co-op is a nonprofit. But there is a potential conflict of interest with the Bike Library because I own the website for the Bike Library (www.FCBikeLibrary.org and .com). I will excuse myself if the BAC discusses the Bike Library. It is an opportunity for anyone else on the BAC to go back and read the Boards and Commissions Manual and guidelines to see if anyone else has a conflict or potential conflict.

Kathleen and Rick report: Clint requests we add an item about BMX to the next agenda. He gave reasons in his email. Event facilities and a cyclo-cross track were also mentioned by citizens in the Bike Co-op listening sessions. Clint will head up the work group on bike facilities in parks as all these fall under the purview of Parks. DK and

Dawn expressed interest in joining the workgroup. Bike facilities and the Parks workgroup will look at the BMX velopark. Council also mandated that the bike education plan consider a bike safety town in a city park.

Jeff Morrell: Do we have all at large member seats filled? The senior advisory is short members and Chris Gaughan moved away. Kathy, Dan and Kim are the only at large members at present. DK will pursue this with the land conservation stewardship board if they have someone interested. The Senior Advisory Board does not have anyone interested.

Adjourn:

Meeting adjourned at 8:10 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Rick Price
Bicycle Advisory Committee Chair