

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

**July 12, 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	970-217-9480
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
Colorado State University: David Hansen
Parks and Recreation Board: Dawn Theis
Senior Advisory Board: Gale Criswell

AT LARGE MEMBERS PRESENT

At Large: Dan Gould
At Large: Cathy Mathis
At Large: Kim Sharpe

ABSENT

Air Quality Board: Greg McMaster
Downtown Development Authority: Kathy Cardona
Poudre School District: John Holcombe
Natural Resources Advisory Board: Clint Skutchan

OPEN

Lands Conservation and Stewardship Board: VACANT

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Citizen: Dottie Spivak, League Cycling Instructor (LCI)
Citizen: Frank Schwende
Citizen: Josh Kerson, Runabout Cycles
City of Fort Collins: Scott Weeks, Senior Transportation Planner
City of Fort Collins: Matt Wempe, Transportation Planner
City of Fort Collins: Gail Neben, Transportation Planning Administrative Assistant

Call to order

Meeting called to order at 6:05 PM

Agenda review:

Chair Rick Price reviewed the agenda. No revisions.

Public Comments:

Schwende: I moved from Ann Arbor where I was on a bike advocacy group. The reason I moved here is for the bike culture. I want to be involved with a bicycle group, so I want to know more about the Bicycle Advisory Committee.

Price: I solicited input for Share the Road and I got several comments. One comment is: The people at the north end have concerns about access across the ditch to the new development where the giant King Soopers is going being built.

Wempe: The news is that the original development came through the process and residents expressed concern regarding a crossing the Larimer/Weld ditch to get to the development. We looked at a bridge and a path, but the ditch company lawyers did not grant easements. It is possible to do a separate bridge like Mulberry over the Poudre, but they have not given permission. It would go to Terry Lake Road. The developer did give \$150,000 or \$250,000 to meet the City's Bicycle Level of Service requirements, but it gives 10 years for the City to design and build it.

Gould: Regarding the Share the Road sign, there was verbal communication from Rob Martin that there is an inappropriate sign southbound on College between Laurel and Myrtle approaching the No-Bike Zone.

Price: I had one citizen write criticizing share the road signs at College and Horsetooth. This is the intersection that started the conversation about Share the Road signs in 2007. For those who live just east of College on Horsetooth, this the only option for heading west. Price receives 2-3 comments a month about bicycle issues resulting from his Coloradoan column. When it is appropriate he suggests sending a note to BAC. He will bring them in to BAC when he collects more comments.

Kerson: I am interested in asking to put electric bikes on the BAC agenda. There have been some laws put in place by the Colorado Department of Transportation to be included on the rail trails. They have been excluded from motorized vehicle laws as long as they are under 20 MPH and 1 horsepower (HP). I want the City to adopt the federal law for people with disabilities using the trails as transportation in the City.

Morrell: Didn't we discuss the trails in relation to the wheelchairs already? What difference does the City have between and two wheels and three wheels?

Kemp: Any motor vehicle can use the trails if they do not use electric power including bicycles and wheelchairs. No gas vehicles are allowed. City code also allows legal use of bike lanes for electric wheelchairs when the sidewalk is not adequate and that is subject to user discretion.

Price: What is the rule on gas powered bikes on bike lanes?

Kemp: They are allowed, but the engine has to be engine 49 cubic centimeters (CC) and under 1 horsepower (HP).

Jenkins: I wonder about the law about electric assist on the trail. How can we get that changed? More people in the future will need it.

Price: To add to that a request needs to be made in the form of a public comment: He is asking what ordinance has to be passed to accommodate the new state law. A 3-foot passing clearance and the wording ‘as practicable’ vs. ‘reasonable and prudent’. Aaron asks ‘determined by whom’? It seems the city ordinance is relevant to bikes regarding federal law, state and city law. Focus on electric bikes only.

Morrell: We can bring it up later and address his question now. Let’s keep it on the table. It is bigger than a conversation.

Gould: I would like to see this as an issue using trails by electric motorized vehicle. What is the federal law? We would need to know the details.

Reider: What is an electric bike?

Kerson: Consumer safe 16CFR defines it as, ‘To keep with CDOT code, electric bikes are restricted to 750 Watts or 1 HP speed on hard surface, the operation 170 Watts and less than 20 mph, and two or three wheels.

Price: Should we address just Joss’s question about electric vehicles, or broaden the discussion about the broader interpretation as addressed in Aaron’s letter?

Gould: I want to discuss it as another agenda item.

Price: I will talk to Kathleen about getting it on the agenda for the next meeting in August.

Cutter: Can we get information to give us interpretation of the law?

Price: Maybe a city attorney can get us information, or DK can get it for us.

Approval of minutes:

Motion to approve the minutes was made by Dan Gould. Rick Price called for questions or changes. No changes were suggested.

The motion seconded by Kim Sharpe.

Minutes were approved by a unanimous vote.

Action items:

Plan Fort Collins/TMP Update-Scott Weeks

Scott gave a copy of the Power Point to the members. He explained Phase 1 and 2 and discussed the next step in the process. The memo dated July 12, 2010, to the BAC from Joe Frank and Scott Weeks, was distributed. Process:

1. Reviewing key policy choices
2. Funneling choices down to a distinct set of choices
3. Defining pros and cons and potential outcomes to determine the preferred direction to move forward.

Now:

1. Seek BAC input on the transportation policy choices and funding options as stated in the “Plan Fort Collins “Vision, Policy Choices, and Proposed Directions” document dated June 23, 2010 (hard copies of transportation section available).
2. Share community feedback with the BAC from the public events held June 29 & 30 as well as input received via on-line surveys to-date (note closing date today).
3. Request BAC provide formal comments regarding the transportation policy choices and funding options to share with the Transportation Board on July 21 and with City Council for their upcoming Council Work Session on July 27.

The comments heard so far were presented. Several comments was regarding enhanced travel corridors on a regional basis, education, elements on the Mason Corridor, and the large issue is long-term funding (how to come up with realistic cost solutions)

From the input we came up with some choices:

System and Services:

Resizing: changing transportation services within existing investments and funding options. Address critical issues and away from expansion. Outcome: accept more congestion, lower maintenance

Reshaping the existing streets:

Encourage modes by utilizing existing ROW, width, better serve changing needs in population; link design to context of land use adjacent to street

Discussion:

Price: Is the T1-A through G list what we are looking at?

Weeks: This is the list we have gathered as key choices from the public input, comments gathered at the public workshop on the 29th and 30th, Boards and Commissions feedback to date, and on-line survey responses. We are looking at the pros and cons of each of them.

Enhanced travel corridors looks at specific areas and supports land use options. It lists focused investments that are district focused, and linking transportation and land use.

Vehicle Alternative/Trails – Facilitate movement of modes of future – where best place might be (res streets, on trails, etc). Includes evaluation, , engineering, education, encouragement, enforcement (help to understand where and why should be operating) Discussion took place regarding types and application of future vehicles. Subject focused on use of electric bikes on trails, including gas powered bikes on bike lanes. BAC voiced support for policy choice but decided that further discussion should take place as a separate agenda item.

System and Mobility Management – Using the existing infrastructure to the fullest extent. Help the system function more effectively using new technology components in the management option.

Adopted Long Term Vision – Looking at the existing goals and policies, and identifying new funding sources to achieve the capital improvement items. The results are in higher transit use, but it also results in higher costs.

Expanded/Enhanced long term visions – Taking the plans in place and looking at what can be done beyond those in respect to what has been approved. This is the most expensive option and thinking beyond the box. It would address congestion and high walkability.

The feedback from open houses, public focus groups, and boards and commissions mostly supports T1-C. Service reductions are supported the least at 8%.

Discussion:

Gould: Were these percentages from the format where people were asked to rank their top 3 choices?

Weeks: Yes, also the online surveys. Please record individual comments on the comment card, since the cut off is today for online entries.

Funding: The two choices are to increase investments or reduce services and live within what we have. The last 10 years shows rapidly declining revenue in transportation. We have state and federal funding in the past, but we cannot rely on these funds in the future. What we have is not feasible.

Discussion:

Cutter: Are these numbers for Fort Collins only?

Weeks: Yes, revenue to the city from taxes and fees. Local, state, and federal funds are used as well.

Morrell: What is a transportation tax?

Weeks: It is a combination. A slide will list the options.

Morrell: This chart comes from the state or just the Ft Collins portion?

Weeks: Slide #23 is what was received in taxes and fees the last 9 years.

The Long Term Vision: Expanding/enhancing long-term visions and “push the envelope”. We have to find other funding measures above what we have.

Increase Transportation investments – This requires new funding sources to enhance current sources. There are some new innovative ideas listed. One source will probably not fund everything so it will need to be a combination.

Accept Reduced Services to live in current our structure – If we don’t decide to find other revenues, where can we reduce services? Asking the public what they prefer, 66% support finding other sources, 75% do not support the existing structure as is.

Our question to committee is: Do these choices reflect your thoughts and desires? We are asking the BAC for a formal letter of support or opinion by this Friday to submit for the Transportation Board and ultimately to the City Council.

Discussion:

Price: In Joe Frank’s memo he requests the BAC present formal comments to share with the Transportation- Board on July 21 and the City Council on July 27. There is nothing new on one hand, but I point out that slide 21 T1B through E conforms with our idea of identifying bike boulevards. The enhance travel corridor concept has been in the Master Plan for some time. Let’s change the language slightly and use enhanced corridors for bikes. Another council threw out the System and mobility management. We should re-think mobility management and one that supports other modes of travel. It brings things together and would suggest that is where we should focus. This will go to Transportation Board and the City Council

Gould: I would suggest that this group would favor all except for T-A. That might be a way to pull it together. All those will support bike and pedestrian transit for the future.

Price: Do you agree with that?

Cutter: The starting point is to take the previous recommendation, and make that letter relative to this. It is the same consistent message, but now it is associated with certain choices.

Price: I recommend that we use the letter we sent in May from the Bike Coop listening sessions and reiterate that opinion.

Cutter: We did not talk about how to fund the projects, but nothing else has changed.

Weeks: What we have done is put validity to what we have heard before. These are including what you have tonight.

Theis: Are we saying we agree with everything except A?

Price: I am guessing we won't pick one or the other, but we are hearing from the committee that we don't want service reductions.

Sharpe: We agree, but I see some choices that are better to support bicycles than others. If we support all it doesn't fit with our recommendations.

Price: Reshaping existing streets to facilitate enhanced travel corridors for bicyclists.

Gould: To get the ideas of a bike boulevard on table, it would be better to talk about it under reshaping the streets. They already include enhancements on a travel corridor.

Sharpe: Take the two letters we have written and match them to the choices. That makes a lot of sense.

Price: Drill down the letter and identify the key items.

Price: Let's take a vote:

Do you want me to write a letter that addresses the two key recommendations we have sent to council the last two sessions and tie them down the last T-1 and I will get a draft out by Wednesday to members?

Sharpe: Will you also develop a matrix to go with the letter?

Price: I will make it a narrative. I will put it as succinctly as possible.

What about T-2?

Gould: I checked all the funding options. We need to make a statement about a bike fee or tax when a bike is sold.

Price: There is a difference between a tax and a fee to own.

Gould: This is why I would check yes on that. We should take a stand on that.

Price: Do we have any idea how many new bikes are sold in Fort Collins? What is the City revenue?

Gould: This would be mostly perception driven.

Sharpe: It would be one little thing to add to the pot.

Price: Do you mean, if we have a bike tax, the people would say we should pay for what we get? Do we want to take a stand tonight? It might be useful for the Transportation Board to know. I am opposed to a license fee. We need to describe it accurately.

Cutter: We need more discussion on the difference between a license fee and a tax.

Sharpe: I think there is a bigger societal issue. Some people are living in poverty and they will not be enforced by a bike licensing law. Will it be seen as punitive for low-income people?

Gould: And, what would the administrative costs be?

Kemp: In the 1980's they found it cost more to administer the program than it brought in.

Price: Other states have a bicycle license fee coordinator. Should we talk about it another time?

Morrell: It is another issue.

Gould: I think we should agree to this purchase fee and it would put us on record of supporting a fee.

Theis: I make a motion that part of your letter include that we approve of exploring the concept of a new bicycle purchase fee or an ownership fee.

Mathis seconded the motion.

Cutter: I would like to hear a comment from a retailer.

Kerson: I am not opposed. It might give an ownership feeling that 'I own this bike lane. I pay taxes and I will use it'. If there is a sticker each year it will show they paid a tax to use the roads, being supportive of a bicycle infrastructure. It would help.

Price: We have a motion on the floor.

Criswell: It does seem like we are volunteering to tax just the bikes for something that goes way beyond the bike projects. \$7 is a lot for poor people. If they buying for their children, will they pay? It is only targeting those purchasing new bikes. There is no guarantee that it will go to bikes. We would be targeting a certain group of people.

Reider: I am opposed to it. It sounds negative. It would be hard to enforce. We need to support Mason and other projects.

Theis: My opinion is for this. I agree we want to discuss this further and define it later. I think we should respond in some way, but we agree to explore other options.

Weeks: We can explore the options later.

Price: Here is an alternative. We acknowledge the idea in our letter and we would be interested in hearing more discussion about it. It comes up all the time and we can take the position that it is worth considering and want to discuss it further.

Acknowledge this in our letter.

Vote was taken. There were two abstentions. (Criswell and Reider abstained and are dubious about a bicycle purchase fee)

Price: To clarify, the motion is that we should write a letter supporting our recommendation citing examples from previous BAC letters to Council on how they fit into the alternatives in T1.

Criswell: I move Rick write the letter.

Motion seconded by Cutter.

Price: Further discussions?

Criswell: There are the transportation choices on funding. Should we talk about the choices on slide 26?

Cutter: It is interesting about a bike ownership tax is that nobody in the room rides all the time instead of using a car. There are students who don't pay any tax, but a large part of the population is also vehicle owners and pays their fair share. The statistics are almost impossible to generate.

Gould: On funding, I would like to see language that would point out that the total cost of an auto-dominated system is huge. The private costs are too high, and that we can garner tremendous savings in the future. If we can do a paradigm shift to enhance other modes, we could receive a boost for the economy.

Price: Can you send the committee seven lines through Rick on this?

Gould: Yes. I want to make sure that is our sentiment.

Price: Other comments?

Kerson: Is it illegal to generate revenue for funding by enforcing excessive emissions? Could the City exact fees to bring in revenues?

Wempe: The state is the regulatory agency for this. Truck emissions are state regulated as well.

Theis: Did your question get answered?

Criswell: It sounds like we are not going to. I hear there is a plan to increase a sales tax. Would we receive any of that?

Price: Council would like to hear on whether we approve of a sales tax.

Gould: I think that 1% sales increase is a major bicycle issue. It covers the surface characteristics of the roadway. The sales tax idea is just a general concept to consider.

Price: It is primary in the minds of city Council. I think the Transportation Board has taken a position in favor.

Theis: Parks commission's stand is that it should be taken to the voters.

Price: City Council has not made the decision yet.

Theis: In light of funding, are the choices to increase funding or not to increase funding? Do we say we support looking into other funding sources? We don't have to commit to one now. We can say we discussed funding. We want you to find additional resources for funding.

Mathis: After the council looks at that, we can discuss later and it is a great boost for bikes and pedestrians.

Weeks: Yes, we can explore this more in the planning process.

Morrell: So our current tax receipts on slide 23, can you tell us if there is any way to tell if any of these fees are going to bike infrastructure? Is the proportion going to stay the same if we raise the taxes?

Price: I think it is no. Almost all the bike enhancement fees have come from federal sources that we would not have had to use for streets.

Morrell: I understand if the board comes together to say we approve, does the bike community get any of this?

Price: Dan's point is that street maintenance comes out of this fund and that enhances bikes.

Morrell: If our taxes will go up to increase the money, why raise the taxes?

Gould: I think it is too early to look at that specific linkage. Policy gives more flexibility on general funding revenue streams. The long term plan does not put this together yet.

Price: It is worth noting that council has been fairly categorical about no earmarking in this new category. They will spend as they see fit.

Motion is that BAC shall write a letter addressing BAC's input on all the T1 systems and services option and include suggestions on T2-Funding options. Motion carried unanimously. Rick Price will get the letter done by Wednesday

Weeks: Thank you.

Discussion/Informational Items

Update on Bicycle Safety and Education Plan-Matt Wempe and David Kemp

Matt gave a power point on the bicycle safety plan. This complements the bike plan we have, focusing on the 5 E s and focusing on education. What we heard is that we need more education for biking safely. What do we mean as a community on the definition of

the core issues of safety? We are focusing on all travel modes in relation to bikes and bike interactions. The timeline is through December. What is the bar, what is our vision, and where can we focus our resources to get there with other groups in the community. The action tool set is a plan that is implementable and action oriented. He went over the next steps and passed out public input received to date. The plan is to be completed by the end of 2010, but it is on-going work in process.

How does BAC feel about this? DK is taking notes projected on the screen as BAC members give their comments.

Discussion:

Price: You have been doing this for several months. What have the experts over the last 15 years come up with as critical to a bike education program?

Wempe: This is not a one-time program. We are focusing on all modes as they interact with bicycles. People walking on off-street trails see bicycles breaking the rules. We have not gotten specifics of what people are teaching in the community. We are focusing on defining the issues. We also understand that others outside Fort Collins are coming here to bike. How can we make it safe for more people?

Kemp: Our efforts are aimed at reducing bike crashes and improving the experience of bikes with other forms of transportation.

Price: Texas has a model program, as do Oregon, and Hawaii. Colorado has adopted some legislation. Education is for children in most cases and on from there. I think what City Council is looking for is a plan that creates some programs. This group can benefit from beginning to understand the opportunities. Is there a model yet? How do we define bike safety?

Wempe: City Council wants us to look at other programs. We are trying to get at what the issues are to address first.

Kemp: We would like a consensus on the definition of bike safety and education. We can take this definition to create the program.

Sharpe: I think bike safety has to include understanding the laws and rules by bikes and motorists.

Gould: The basics are that we need to emphasize children and CSU students.

Sharpe: Seniors as well.

Theis: Newcomers are demographic.

Morrell: We can give a pamphlet to DUI people to understand that a bike is a vehicle that has to follow the rules of the road.

Sharpe: Let's look at what this means.

Jenkins: Road accidents and the fatality rate is part of the definition.

Price: Are we defining bike safety or bike safety education?

Wempe: We have used the terms interchangeably. Safety education is instructional tools.

Theis: To me one would be rules of the road and trails, and what kind of equipment is helpful.

Kemp: If someone gave you a pamphlet would that be education in your mind? If someone wants to talk to you about it, is that also considered education? What about the co-exist campaign? Is that education? Several people have said yes.

Price: That is public relations and marketing instead of education. I suggest you look at the 1997 bike plan. It identifies groups and ways to address these groups.

Kemp: We are creating the actual plan.

Price: This group will not provide a comprehensive list. We have until 7:55 PM and it is now 7:50 PM. (Explanation: This item was allotted 40 minutes; however, the discussion was shortened by the Chair.)

Morrell: When do you have to wrap up?

Wempe: The deadline for the memo is August.

Morrell: Are you compiling comments from BAC and others as well?

Mathis: I think of kids as unsafe cyclists. We should be getting the word to kids' groups such as scouts. Groups can bring their kids to get bike education.

Morrell: Being able to get where you are going and have mutual respect for drivers and bikers.

Reider: No I think you have it. I like Rick's suggestion of going through the 1997 plan.

Cutter: I think one of the things lacking is an in depth understanding of what caused a fatality on a bike. A formal organization that would have that information we could utilize to help the bike education. Like forming a bike review board.

Price: A comprehensive bike education plan to teach ages 5-14 and CSU students.

Criswell: My thought was that the brochure is education, but to me safety is knowing what the laws are. I think other people don't know.

Sharpe: Bike safety includes teaching all aspects and issues and teaching others about all those issues. Bike safety is the means to create safety. The things are awesome to do but not defining what safety is.

Gould: Safety equipment, safety skills.

Kerson: You would like to see what the material is to be transferred.

Weeks: Putting a local context to safety.

Kemp: We will take the information from all of the different sources and use it to provide a memo to City Council in August.

Price: The League of American Bicyclists has a list of "need to know" information about bicycling and bicycle safety.

Mathis: Can Rick send the one-page index?

Price: Yes.

Share the Road Signs-Rick Price

Price: I can move this to the next meeting. There is not much to report.

FC Bikes Survey Report

Kemp: During May we conducted a FC Bikes survey. With the help of Betsy Jacobson and Gail Hoffman, the Transportation Planning staff put together ten questions. It was distributed to the people from www.FCBikes.com website, and a link to the site in the CityNews that went out in the utility bill. The results of the survey are in this Power Point.

Price: Maybe you could go through and highlight those that are relative to this committee.

Kemp: Yes, we went through all the functions that bikes play in the community and 84% said yes they play an important part.

Cutter: Was there anything you found that was a surprise? I think the people taking the survey were skewed.

Morrell: The statistics might not be good, but the results are telling.

(Chair's note: the survey results were not in final report form but merely raw data and are not included in these minutes. Anyone interested in the survey or the results can contact the Dave Kemp.)

Staff Report:

Kemp: Dan Burden is speaking Wednesday at the Rio Bike Nites event series.

July 21 is Dom Nozzi on what bike safety and education means to an urban planner.

Betsy Jacobson scheduled the next Wednesday, July 28.

Price: Would you send a reminder to this group every Monday?

Kemp: Yes. Also, we need to get one more member from the Land Conservation Board to replace Chris.

The Bike to Work day report was very encouraging.

Price: Do you prepare a written report?

Kemp: Yes

Price: This group would like to read it. Either on-line or a hard copy.

Board Member Reports/Comments:

Theis: There is a program called Women on Bikes that I have been participating in. It is good for beginners. It includes another audience. The bike maintenance clinic was very popular. There is a meet-up site for it.

Price: Please send Gail and Rick the information for another meeting.

Kemp: I can do that.

Share The Road / BPEC:

Price: There is a story in Coloradoan on the Poudre Wilderness Volunteers and they have done great work. They have done some policing and respecting the laws. This is a great concept, to call on fellow cyclists to enforce the laws.

Price: I would like to remind the BAC of the April City Council resolution on what the council wants to see in a Bicycle Safety Education Plan (Read the resolution which is pasted here)

RESOLUTION 2010-019
OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FORT COLLINS
DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER TO PURSUE THE CONCEPT
OF A "MASTER CYCLIST" PROGRAM AND A "BIKE SAFETY TOWN"
IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BIKE SAFETY EDUCATION PLAN

WHEREAS, at the March 2, 2010 meeting of the City Council, the Council requested that the Congestion Management and Air Quality Grant (“CMAQ”) for the City’s FC Bikes Program be amended to utilize \$15,000 to \$20,000 for the issuance of a request for proposals (“RFP”) for the purpose of hiring a coordinator to assist with the development of the Bike Safety Education Plan, among other things; and

WHEREAS, the proposal of engaging through an RFP process a coordinator for that purpose has met with concerns on the part of the North Front Range MPO and the Colorado Department of Transportation and would, at the least, cause delay in the City’s ability to obtain the CMAQ grant; and

WHEREAS, the City Bicycle Advisory Committee has recommended that the CMAQ grant be executed without the proposed amendment for the issuance of an RFP but that the City Manager pursue the work suggested by the Council, as a part of a future project of the staff of the City; and

WHEREAS, the Council has determined that the approach recommended by the Bicycle Advisory Committee is in the best interests of the City and that the City Manager should be directed accordingly.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FORT COLLINS that the City Manager is hereby directed to pursue the writing of the Bike Safety Education Plan, and in connection therewith to develop the concept of a “Master Cyclist” program and to also explore the use of annual “Building on Basics” revenues to potentially assist in the construction of a “Bike Safety Town” in one of the City’s parks and, finally, to coordinate the Bike Safety Education Plan Project closely with the Safe Routes to School program.

Passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the Council of the City of Fort Collins this 16th day of March A.D. 2010.

Mayor

ATTEST:

City Clerk

New Business/Future Agenda Items:

Gould: I can give a report in August on my analysis of individual bike crashes. (10 minutes)

Cutter: I’d like to follow up on the electric bikes on city trails discussion.

Kemp: A number of projects have come through the Energy Conversation Block Grant.

Weeks: Two bike projects and one pedestrian project. We need BAC input. One is the “bike box” on Plum and Shields, and the other is Mountain Avenue improvements for bicycling across College to Riverside.

Price: Do you need input or just info?

Weeks: We would like to receive input on the design.

Price: Please be explicit on what input you would like. Thank you.

Other Business:

None

Adjourn:

Meeting adjourned at 8:18 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Rick Price
Bicycle Advisory Committee Vice-Chair