

Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) Meeting Minutes

June 27, 2016, 6:00 p.m.

Community Room
215 North Mason Street
Fort Collins, CO 80522

FOR REFERENCE:

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------|
| Chair, Sylvia Cranmer | 970-493-5277 |
| Staff Liaison, Tessa Greegor | 970-416-2471 |

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Ragan Adams, Parks and Recreation Board
Annabelle Berklund, Transportation Board (alternate)
Aaron Buckley, Fort Collins Bike Co-op (future replacement for Ryan Nicholson)
Sylvia Cranmer, Chair, Colorado State University
Mark Houdashelt, Air Quality Advisory Board
Chris Johnson, Bike Fort Collins, Director
Ryan Nicholson, Fort Collins Bike Co-op
Edward Reifsnnyder, Land Conservation & Stewardship Board
York, Transportation Board

AT LARGE MEMBERS PRESENT

Cathy Busch-Kinkaid, At Large Member
Patrick McCarty, At Large Member

ABSENT

Luke Caldwell, Natural Resource Advisory Board
Todd Dangerfield, Downtown Development Authority
Bruce Henderson, Parks and Recreation Board (alternate)
Chris Hunt, Poudre School District
Kelly McDonnell, Bicycle Pedestrian Education Coalition
Greg Wells, Senior Advisory Board

CITY OF FORT COLLINS STAFF PRESENT

Emma Belmont Transfort
Tessa Greegor, FC Bikes Program Manager
Aaron Iverson, FC Moves
Amy Lewin, FC Moves
Paul Sizemore, FC Moves Program Manager

GUESTS and CITIZENS PRESENT

Mike Case
Sandy Lemberg (brief 10 minute appearance for public comment)
Ted Manahan
Kristi Savig, Recorder
Kane Smith (Guest from UC Health)

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was preceded with dinner provided by the Food Co-op (5:45 – 6:00), and called to order by Chair Sylvia Cranmer at 6:01 p.m.

AGENDA REVIEW

The chair also introduced city staff presentations for the evening. Both Aaron Iverson (Senior Transportation Planner, FC Moves) and Amy Lewin (Senior Transportation Planner for FC Moves) will be asking for written support of the BAC regarding City initiatives presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Kane Smith (Guest representing UC Health & Medical Center of Rockies) introduced himself and stated his purpose of attending was to gather information related to possible collaboration with UC Health related to safety and health goals.

Sandy Lemberg was present for public comments to bring attention to issues surrounding implementation of buffered [protected] bike lane dividers. His concern was over the safety of bike riders surrounding curb-like dividers. His preference would be simple bike lane or rumble strip dividers. Sandy noted his frequency biking Remington Street. He agrees that the lane striping appears to be adequate here. He also noted concern about the impacts to traffic flow related to the new Remington Roundabout and Elizabeth and Pitkin intersection traffic light removals.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Sylvia Cranmer (Chair) made a motion to approve the minutes of May 23, 2016, as written. A second to the motion was made and the minutes were approved by BAC members present. Two (2) members abstained who were not present at May meeting.

FOLLOW-UP FROM PRIOR MEETING/FUTURE BUSINESS

May's meeting including minor revisions and approval of the BAC Plan for 2016 and further development of BAC Onboarding documents. Final drafts of both documents were included in the agenda packet and available to members attending the meeting. The Chair mentioned these documents and pointed out the following items noted in the *BAC at a Glance* document:

- BAC Committee members represent 12 various Boards and Commissions, plus a member from the Transportation Board.
- Both a Chair and Vice Chair should be identified. No Vice Chair is currently active.

These materials/documents will become part of the onboarding documents available online to new committee members.

Cathy Busch-Kinkaid (Member at Large) made the suggestion that the onboarding process could be more of a collaborative process. She further clarified: provide new members orientation within first month or two or attendance; include a walkabout of city facility offices; and clearly define the member's roles and responsibilities as it relates to the boards/commissions they represent. Cathy also asked that the Chair and/or City representative provide an opportunity for new members to provide feedback on the onboarding process a couple months after their term begins. The Chair and Tessa Gregor (FC Bikes) clarified that an option for e-mail, telephone, or face-to-face communication was available in addition to the provided online onboarding documents. The Chair discounted the idea of touring city facilities. This would require valuable time of city

workers, especially with the frequency on onboarding new members. York (Transportation Board) suggested that interested members could participate in CityWorks for a comprehensive overview of the City.

ACTION ITEMS

Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), Aaron Iverson, FC Planning Services for FC Moves

Aaron Iverson presented the West Elizabeth and City Park Protected Intersection Improvement Project that is being considered for TAP funding (2018-2020). The intersection project is among a few for which the City is considering submitting for the grant.

The City is asking several committees & boards for letters of recommendation for the project. Following Aaron's presentation and discussion (below), York (Transportation Board) moved that the BAC (e.g., Chair) write a letter of support for the Elizabeth and City Park Protected Intersection project. The letter should include reference to the project's safety and crash prevention features, as well as being a good investment of dollars for the West Elizabeth Corridor project, further improving bicycling and pedestrian traffic. Ragan Adams (Parks and Recreation) seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Presentation Details, Discussion, and Q&A:

TAP Grant opportunity for FY2018-FY2020 projects

- Federal funds available
- Authorized under Federal Transportation Bills
- Administered by CDOT, by region. (FC in Region 4)
- Grant purpose includes enhanced bicycling and walking, among other categories
- Approximately \$2 million will be awarded by CDOT each year for 3 years (2018-2020)

The City's last TAP Grant received supported the Pitkin Low Stress Bicycle project

The current TAP Project being proposed would include improvements to the West Elizabeth & City Park intersection, as designed in the West Elizabeth Transportation Corridor (ETC) project. The city is also reviewing other projects for potential TAP proposals. The North College Gap Project would be a partnered project with Larimer County to address sidewalk deficiencies in the area. In addition, the City is also considering submitting a TAP Grant application to construct a grade-separated crossing of the Power Trail at Harmony.

W. Elizabeth/City Park Intersection TAP Proposal

The project implements a Dutch-type intersection that protects bikers and pedestrians up to and through the intersection. Main elements include protected islands at corners that will slow traffic turning and allow bikers to stay on the right side of traffic through the intersection and turns.

City requesting BAC support letter to include with the FC Moves proposal for TAP Grant funding.

- Projects need to be under \$1 million total cost; Amy mentioned that the grant request would likely be close to this amount.
- City will provide additional matching (20%) if Grant is received. CDOT may consider added "in-kind" donations (e.g., labor support) for awarded TAP Grants. The match could come from other accounts of the city.
- CDOT allows the City to apply for multiple TAP projects, though it is unlikely that funding would be provided for both (the City would need to prioritize the projects).

Discussion, Q&A

The ETC was initially considering a roundabout at this intersection—is that no longer being considered? Amy answered that although a roundabout was initially considered, the protected intersection is now the preferred design at this location.

What is the timeframe for the decision process? Grants will be due in August and awarded at end of year. There is a BFO offer for this intersection, as well.

Chris Johnson, suggested that the North College county project would also be worth supporting.

Ryan asked if the Harmony grade-separated crossing would be ready for submittal in time for this TAP grant process. Aaron said Engineering is still considering whether to submit this application, but the project has been submitted for grant dollars before.

York asked what other boards will be requested to write letters of support. Aaron and Amy responded: CSU Bicycle Advisory Committee, Bike Fort Collins and the West Elizabeth Stakeholder Committee. York also suggested presenting to the Built Environment Working Group (BEWG).

CMAQ (Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality) funds were previously requested but not received for the Harmony project

Motion and Discussion

York motioned that the BAC approve a letter of support for the project's TAP application presented by Aaron this evening. Ragan Adams seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously by BAC members present.

The Chair inquired about the format for this support letter. Aaron is looking for a letter of recommendation from the BAC to affirm the city applying for such grant. Sylvia wanted to be sure we not supporting competing projects. A letter of support would be to show overall committee support. Ragan suggested that a few reasons also be added in the letter for each project.

Ed Reifsnnyder (Land Conservation & Stewardship Board) asked if the City has any priorities for the projects considered. Paul mentioned that the City has only committed to submitting the West Elizabeth intersection proposal at this point. The Harmony grade-separated crossing is also important, and will be a priority if the City pursues both TAP applications. Paul Sizemore (FC Moves Program Manager) referenced CDOT's scoring process and mentioned that applying for multiple projects does have benefits.

York again moved that we write a letter of support for the Elizabeth and City Park Intersection Project, including additional safety and accident preventions, given that the project is a good investment of dollars for the ETC and to improve bicycling and pedestrian traffic. Ragan seconded. The motion passed.

INFORMATIONAL/DISCUSSION ITEMS

West Elizabeth Enhanced Travel Corridor Plan (Amy Lewin FC Moves/Emma Belmont Transfort)

Amy Lewin and Emma Belmont summarized progress of the West Elizabeth Corridor Plan (ETC), last presented to the BAC in November 2015. The final Recommended Design and Phasing plans were presented for BAC input with a request for written support of the Plan to add to the anticipated Transportation Board's (TB) recommendation to City Council. The interactive presentation and discussion included considerations for bike-related infrastructures and treatments proposed, as well as acknowledgement that the City's Intergovernmental

Agreement with Colorado State University (CSU) will be further addressed as it relates to the eastern edge of the West Elizabeth Corridor and CSU's Shields Street underpass planning.

Mark Houdashelt (Air Quality Advisory Board) moved that the BAC write a letter of support to the Transportation Board (TB) regarding the bicycling aspects of the West Elizabeth Corridor (ETC) Plan. The motion was seconded by Patrick McCarty (Member at Large) and passed.

Presentation Details, Discussion, and Q&A:

The presenters were requesting BAC members' written support of the bike related Recommended Design and Phasing aspects of the ETC Plan and specifically recommendations for the TB's consideration as to the bike related facilities and treatments that would be best for the corridor. The plan is to present to the City Council in mid-August for approval (*note – schedule has since been changed*).

West Elizabeth Enhanced Travel Corridor (ETC) Plan

Definition

- ETC's are uniquely designed corridors that are being planned for high frequency transit, bicycling, and walking connections. Growth management strategies, focusing growth where it makes sense.

Overview

- The West Elizabeth ETC will provide opportunities to connect CSU Foothills Campus on the west to the MAX transit stations on campus on the east. The corridor's south and north boundaries are W. Prospect Rd. and W. Mulberry St. respectively.
- The Plan has an 18-month timeline (March 2015 – August 2016).
 - Currently the City is in the last Phase of the Plan (March 2015 – August 2016)
 - Recommended Design
 - Implementation Planning
 - (going to Council in August)
- Community engagement and outreach was part of the ongoing planning process; key themes included:
 - Corridor needs to be safe and comfortable for all users
 - Transit should be prioritized for the future
 - Users want reliable transportation options for all modes

Vision

- Corridor is unique and adaptable (The west and east sections of the corridor are very different)
- Be safe and comfortable for all users
- Encourage and prioritize public transportation
- Support the interconnectivity of all modes
- Be a beautiful and vibrant environment

Project Guiding Principles

- Focusing on ETC definition (see above)
- Minimize right-of-way impacts
- Consider phasing of projects and potential funding throughout implementation

Phasing Objectives

- Avoid revisions and modification after implementation
- Use public funds wisely and efficiently

Project Summary Handout provided to BAC members outlined proposed phasing for walking, driving, transit, and biking. Existing conditions, identified needs, and how the vision is addressed was summarized for each type of travel mode. Phasing details included:

- Near term (2016) proposals
- Interim Improvements (2-5 years out)—*Includes completion of the bike network*
- Recommended Design (funding dependent)—*Includes combination of protected/buffered bike lanes and protected intersection)*
- Scenario for What if Campus West Redevelops?

Amy summarized the biking elements of the ETC Recommended Design:

- One-way protected, buffered bike lanes
- Intersection treatments—green paint and two-stage turn boxes
- City Park & West Elizabeth pilot protected intersection (2,000 cyclists/day go through here)
- N/S crossing improvements at Rocky/Azuro, Ponderosa, Constitution, and Skyline
- Bike lane goes behind bus stop islands to minimize conflicts between buses and bikes
 - o Bus stop islands adjacent to roadway vehicular travel lane, similar to platforms used for MAX—1st time design for FC, platform includes additional amenities.
 - o Streamlines bus loading and unloading
 - o Tradeoffs
 - Reduces conflicts between bikes and buses but requires pedestrians to cross bike lane (raised, marked humps used to slow down bikes and keep ground level for pedestrians)
 - Slightly increases traffic delays but minimizes property impacts
 - o Mostly bus stop islands throughout corridor with bus pullouts at Skyline (near church) and near Rocky.

York suggested that the bus stop islands be considered over pullouts to avoid bike/bus conflicts.

Intergovernmental agreement between City and CSU

The corridor plan also has crossover points with the CSU project for the Shields Street underpass.

- Due to timing of ETC and Underpass, the plan document includes references to the underpass, yet complete design will be addressed by the separate CSU project in collaboration with the City.

Next Steps:

- Develop draft Plan
- Public review of draft Plan
- City Council Adoption Hearing, August 2016

Discussion, Q&A

Chair mentioned concern over variability of treatments for cyclists to maneuver.

Is the bus stop island concept similar to Bus Rapid Transit? Yes

What have you learned from the Mason Street Corridor project that is being applied?

- Amy mentioned the parking spots along corridor are insufficient
- Many other issues were addressed (learning process) with MAX planners
- Aligning funding with grant requirements
- Curb heights

Would a MAX Line on Elizabeth change the design plan?

- The benefits of dedicated lanes for buses did not outweigh the tradeoffs.

- Common elements with MAX Line – consistent schedules, platforms, off-bus fare payment

What is basis for decision to use separated bike lane design? (Chris Johnson)

- Online community polls
- Staff discussion on tradeoffs (snow maintenance, visibility, cost)
- Tessa added concerns for pedestrian conflicts with sidewalks (raised bike lane option).

You mentioned bicyclists going the wrong way in lanes. How is the Shields and Elizabeth underpass going to address traffic flow on the wrong side of street? (York)

- Concept currently is for underpass to be on the South side of Elizabeth.
- “The real problem with wrong-way riding is where riding crosses over driveway pullouts.” We are working on how best to address this—e.g., considering moving driveways so two-way bicycle traffic would not have to cross a driveway, as well as other alternatives.

Chris added question about what causes the wrong-way riding? The Elizabeth medians and flow of traffic in and out of businesses seems to conflict with crossing over to correct side of road.

Chair asked about Subway and Campus West Businesses are unhappy with underpass limiting access. Amy addressed that business access and loss of parking spaces are items that are being addressed by the Shields/Elizabeth team.

Mark asked about the City Park Intersection – The only right-of-way impacts at this corner will be on the NW corner where CSU land exists. Minimal impacts to 7-Eleven and Starbucks.

Raised curb concerns when turning left

- While breaks in the curb will need to be considered to facilitate left-terns, the addition of two-stage left-turn boxes would provide an alternate way to turn left.

What are the major compromises that have had to be made in this project?

- Bus stop islands
- Access management, especially at Taft Hill and Elizabeth (near Kings Soopers)
- Decided not to incorporate dedicated bike signal phases because it would have increased vehicular traffic delay too much

Is mode shift a goal?

- Transportation/air quality impacts manual addresses this, but was not completed prior to ETC development.
- This will be addressed in future, even though it is hard to quantify.

Questions for the Committee

Does the Committee support the Recommended Design and phasing? (Recommendation for T-Board’s consideration)

- A memo could be written that would be attached to the T-board’s review.

As summarized above, Mark moved that the BAC write a letter of support to the T-Board regarding the bicycling aspects of the West Elizabeth ETC Plan. The motion was seconded (Patrick) and passed.

Ragan recommended that additional coordination be included addressing the eastern part of the corridor and how it relates to the CSU Underpass plans. Mark also asked if additional discussion on the “rumble strips” idea should be considered.

Downtown Plan (Amy Lewin, FC Moves)

Amy Lewin provided meeting participants with an overview of the new Downtown Plan 2016 as it relates to bike related themes and concerns. The goal of the presentation was to start the conversation about the bike related aspects of the plan themes, concepts, and services. A summary of the presentation, BAC discussion, and questions follow below. Next steps for the Downtown Plan include to Draft the Plan in Summer 2016, and to prepare for Public Review and City Council Adoption Hearing in the Fall of 2016.

Presentation Details, Discussion, and Q&A:

Timeline - Jan 2015 Phase 1 through October 2016 Phase 5. Currently the City is in Phase 4, Document Development.

Plan Themes:

1. Pedestrian-oriented (“built for people”)
2. Unique
3. Inclusive for all ages and economic types

Document Layout addresses different topic areas and character districts.

Trans & Parking Update:

Overall the Plan is looking at how we can provide great choices for getting to/from and around downtown. The key principles include: Multi-Modal Infrastructure & Services; Parking Management; and Communication

1. Multi-Model Infrastructure & Services
 - Underlying aspect of Climate Action Plan
 - Bike network comes out of the 2014 Bike Plan
 - Coexistence of modes around alleys, on Walnut, and Linden
 - Looking at funding source options
 - Including already adopted plans
 - Keep track of travel modes long-term

Ragan asked to include bus stop improvements

2. Parking Management – in addition to addressing vehicle parking policies, it includes providing a comprehensive Bike Parking Management Plan
 - Existing conditions
 - Best practices
 - Recommendations

Ragan asked if hanging bikes are something that would add bike capacity.

3. Communication related to travel information and wayfinding
 - Also marketing downtown options,
 - Also working with employers to provide bike/walking incentives

Amy anticipates future addressing of bike issues. Tonight was mainly to start the conversation.

As part of the downtown plan, Amy introduced some initial concepts for the Riverside Gateway (corridors).

Initial concepts:

- Access control plan to increase visibility of bikers and walkers

- Multi-use path on north side of Riverside, with connections up to the Poudre River Trail
- Underpass at Olive is also being considered

Canyon Avenue diagonal from Mulberry north.

Initial concepts:

- Flex space
- Improve intersections

York suggested parking protected bike lane (difficult to cross at intersections). Amy thought diagonal parking might alleviate problem. Reverse angle parking also an option, but there were concerns with this, and it is no longer being considered within this design.

Aaron Buckley emphasized the need for a bike lane on Canyon, design changes to slow down traffic and make the Mulberry/Canyon intersection safer.

Discussion, Q&A

BAC Member likes the idea of Riverside Gateway trail for additional access to downtown.

Could electric bike charging stations be available as well as for Electric Vehicles?

Bus stop improvements and cross-overs with bicycles should be looked at.

York suggested considering multi-modal transportation options for the Plan—e.g., bikes, buses, walking

Ryan asked about the mixture of city- versus business-owned bike racks. The point is for consistency across bike rack design. Personal preference accommodates mountain bike & other bikes, vinyl coated, 2-point contacts or something to lean up bike against. Amy mentioned that those are elements of best practices in bike racks and that the City considers functionality first when it comes to bike rack design and placement.

Budgeting for Outcomes (BFO) – Overview of FC Moves Offers (Paul Sizemore, FC Moves)

Paul Sizemore gave an overview of the City’s bike related projects and budgets captured through the Budgeting for Outcomes (BFO) process for 2017-2018. A one-page summary was provided to BAC members present including the enhancements and ongoing/core focus areas described below. See <http://www.fcgov.com/bfo> for a complete list of all projects being considered for the City Council’s budget consideration. BAC members were asked to review the provided FC Moves Offer Summary and other transportation etc. Offers (see <http://www.fcgov.com/citymanager/pdf/transportation-budget-2016.pdf>) closely in the next few weeks. Come prepared to prioritize bike-related Offers at the July meeting.

The following presentation and discussion points were addressed in response to the FC Moves 2017-2018 Offer Summary (as of 6/27/16 for BAC meeting). The handout included specific 2017 and 2018 costs proposed.

- More details available at BFO (Budgeting for Outcomes, see <http://www.fcgov.com/bfo/> type in Budget).

2017-2018 BFO Offers – FC Moves Summary

Enhancements - Focus on these for BAC future discussions

- A. Bicycle Specific Offers (3.4, 3.7, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 3.22)
 - Infrastructure enhancement offers
- B. Bicycle Related Offers (3.6, 3.13, 3.14, 3.17, 3.19, 3.23)
- C. Other Offers (3.3, 3.12, 3.15, 4.1)

An update to the City Plan and Bike Master Plan should also be considered. The Neighborhood BFO includes these aspects as part of the Master Transportation Plan.

Ongoing/Core Offers –Primarily routine services and staff/program support

- 3.2, 3.18, 3.20, 3.21

E.g. 3.18 - Safe Routes to School Program – the Grant dollars received have typically funded the program. The BFO offer would supplement the grants and insure the school rotation for this safety project would be consistent and include all schools.

What projects will fall away if they are not funded in a BFO.

- Only 3.4 (CCIP Bicycle Infrastructure) is the only item that is already established through existing tax initiative.
- If other Offers are not funded by Council,FC Moves will look for other funding options.

Administration Employee benefit changes will be taking a portion of City funds.

- Shifting hourly employees to salary with benefits.
- As well as health care benefits for city employees not currently receiving them

NEXT STEPS:

The BFO Offers will be going to Council in August/September for discussion.

In the July BAC meeting, the BAC should prioritize Paul’s presented items for the Transportation Board for their consideration in their August meeting (see Action Items).

The Chair asked that members look online before July meeting. Send an e-mail to BAC members if there is anything specific to discuss offline.

Discussion, Q&A

What are BAC members supposed to do with this list of Offers? The Chair said that we could prioritize the list and/or select the top 4 items off the list. Paul mentioned this list is just a preview presented for the board for consideration. Take a look on line, look at offers that are borderline in priority; when approaching the offers presented.

Q. Are all offers are linked to strategic objectives of the Bike Master Plan?

A. YES

York asked if the BAC needs to look at other department BFO Offers?

- Ragan said it would not be a concern for Parks and Rec Department. Trail related projects will be getting their own specific funding.

REPORTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Transportation Board Report (York, FC Transportation Board)

York provided BAC members an overview of the Wednesday, June 15th Transportation Board (TB) monthly meeting and other reports/news from the TB that the BAC would be interested in.

- The transportation board accepted the 2016 BAC Work Plan, approved by BAC members in May 2016.
- York mentioned that the TB Plan for 2017 needs to be drafted in September. This is earlier than before due to deadline changes imposed by the City Council.
- Super Issues Meeting – fugitive dust project presented
- Night Lighting presented– included changes to bike lit pathways.

Russ Cunniff was at the TB meeting in June. Comments provided by Mr. Cunniff included:

- He felt the Bike Work Plan was too constrictive (as noted by Mark Houdashelt).
- Ross also mentioned the Council has a 2-year work plan.
- Ross Cunniff discussed new board review (certification) processes/forms.

Many BAC members attended the June TB meeting.

Staff Reports (Tessa Greegor, FC Moves and FC Bikes)

The Mason and Laurel bike lanes will be completed in next few weeks.

Zagster numbers for May will be shared via e-mail by Tessa.

Due to some FC Moves member schedule conflicts the week of July 25th, Tessa suggested that the July Meeting could be moved to July 18th. An alternate location might also need to be considered. Early August could also work. It was decided to use a Doodle Poll to determine best time.

Board Member Reports/Comments

Mark Houdashelt (Air Quality Advisory Board) – Due to the change in TB Plans deadlines, the due dates for the 2017 BAC Work Plan should be reconsidered, possibly for August.

YORK (Transportation Board) –Emphasized that members review the BFO web site and consider joining together in prioritizing bike-related initiatives (Offers). Bike to Work Day comments: Golden Meadows Park – trail crews were obstructing the trail throughout the day. Conflicts with Parks Department bobcats etc. Also due to wind issues, the types of signs used for Bike to Work Day should be reviewed for future events. Open Streets was fun

Chris Johnson (Bike Fort Collins) – A new advocacy group is forming to discuss issues similar to what the BAC addresses. This Bike Fort Collins group will be made up of bike enthusiasts. See Bike Fort Collins Facebook page or website (BikeFC.org) for additional events and details.

Ryan Nicholson (FC Bike Co-op) – The Co-op is getting a new roof. Construction starting in July-September. Access from Hickory would be best during construction. Ryan will be stepping down as of this meeting. Aaron Buckley will be serving as Co-Op representative in the future.

Cathy Busch-Kinkaid (Member at Large) - Asked about Bike to Work Day numbers – Approximately over 10,000 station visits, with 800 participants being at New Belgium station.

Sylvia Cranmer (Colorado State University) – Recent presentations have been made at CSU in regards to covered bike parking. The Admissions office continues to spread the bike culture. CSU working to get bike orientation integrated into CSU coursework.

NEW BUSINESS/FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

The August meeting will include addressing the 2017 BAC Work Plan

ACTION ITEMS

Memorandums or letters will be drafted by Chair Cranmer related to the passed motions for BAC's support of the City's TAP grant application, and recommendation of bike-related aspects of the ETC Plan.

BAC members were asked to review the provided FC Moves Offer Summary and other transportation etc. offers (see <http://www.fcgov.com/citymanager/pdf/transportation-budget-2016.pdf>) closely in the next few weeks. Come prepared to prioritize bike-related Offers at the July meeting. Send an e-mail to BAC members if there is anything specific to discuss offline.

A Doodle Poll will be facilitated by Tessa Greigor to determine when the July meeting could be conducted with the most members attending.

ADJOURN

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:55 pm.