

CITY OF AUSTIN  
BICYCLE ADVISORY COUNCIL (BAC)  
MEETING SUMMARY

City Hall, Boards and Commission Room  
301 W. 2<sup>nd</sup>  
December 17, 2013  
6:00PM

PARTICIPANTS:

Christopher Stanton – BAC Vice Chair  
Tommy Eden – BAC  
Sophia Benner – BAC  
Noni Jarnagin – Alt BAC

Tom Thayer – BAC  
Allison Kaplan – Alt BAC  
Pete Wall – Alt BAC  
Larry Murphy – Alt BAC

Chris LeBlanc – Alt BAC  
Tom Wald - Alt BAC  
Tom Hilde – Alt BAC

GUESTS:

Stanton Truxillo  
Joel Meyer  
Stuart Werbner

Alex Kone (CAMPO Staff)  
Dayton Crites  
Randall Dillard

Elliott McFadden  
Jesse Duncan

STAFF PRESENT:

Aleksiiina Chapman  
Nathan Wilkes

Robert Anderson  
Neil Kopper

Jim Dale  
Robert Spillar

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

**Discussion and Possible Action** – Mobility35 – Mr. Spillar presents two options to move forward: depressing or elevating I35. Mobility35 includes bicycle options and includes looking at safe crossings across the corridor. Goals of the project are to increase capacity of I35 as well as increasing safety for all modes.

Propositions include:

- Adding an additional vehicle lane of unspecified type.
- Intersection improvements including a roundabout and a diverging diamond intersection.
- A shared use path from Stassney to William Cannon.
- Where space is limited a 14' shared use lane.
- Sidewalks south of Ben White.

Total program cost: \$1.3 – 1.9 million

Mr. Eden asks if they considered narrowing the lanes to accommodate a bicycle lane on the frontage road and Mr. Thayer asks if a wider sidewalk was considered instead of a 14' wide outside lane. Mr. Wald suggests a technical subcommittee on this topic. Mr. Wald suggests collaboration with the Bicycle Program to determine creative solutions instead of using a wide-use lane. Mr. Wald asks if the goal of a shared use path is shared among different counties. Mr.

Miller responds that they have not gotten to that stage yet and Mr. Spillar adds that the right-of-way will be very tight in Williamson County. Mr. Wald asks how the projects are going to be prioritized and who will choose. Mr. Spillar responds that different pots of money lend themselves to some projects more than others, and also that some projects require other projects to be built before they can be complete. The first projects to be invested in may be sidewalks and bike accommodations since they are less expensive and there are businesses which lack access to bikes and pedestrians along these routes. Some projects involve full environmental processes and others are exempt. Ms. Kaplan comments that with highway projects the largest importance for cyclists are crossings and she encourages a technical subcommittee. Mr. Wald moves that a technical subcommittee related to the Mobility35 project be formed after the holidays. Mr. Thayer seconds the motion. Motion passes.

- **Discussion and Possible Action** – Pressler Extension – Mr. Spillar introduces the project: access near Austin High School is limited and there is no access to the neighborhood north of the railroad. The Pressler Extension is intended to provide access from Pressler to Lamar Beach with a roundabout at Cesar Chavez/Reserve Rd/Pressler. The goal is to focus pedestrians into a safe crossing instead of impromptu rail crossings. The private Paul Street crossing will be closed and Pressler will be the primary crossing. Another goal is to provide a transit access point to the managed lanes on Mopac. Current bicycle facilities on Pressler are a climbing lane and shared use paths on each side. The developer may fund a park plan for the area south of the tracks near Pressler.

Mr. Thayer is concerned that the increased traffic will make crossing the L.A.B. more difficult. Mr. Eden points out a large tunnel under the tracks further west of Paul that could potentially accommodate bike and pedestrians. Mr. Spiller says that between Lamar and MoPac this is the only place that a crossing can be built. Mr. LeBlanc is concerned that this street will quickly become highly travelled by cars. Mr. Wald asks if cycle tracks may be possible instead of a shared use path and Mr. Spiller responds that it was highly examined.

- **Discussion and Possible Action** – CAMPO 2040 Plan – Mr. Wald suggested a technical subcommittee because of time concerns. Mr. Kone briefly introduces the CAMPO 2040 plan. There have been a few rounds of public outreach on the plan and there will be increased public outreach in 2014. Mr. Wald emphasizes this major opportunity to give input on the planning process. Input needs to be given before February so that projects for funding are able to be prioritized. Council Member Riley states that this is an opportunity to discuss policy change for bike and ped planning. For example, CAMPO considers a wide outside lane as an acceptable facility. C.M. Riley suggests that this policy be revisited and thinks that this may be an opportunity for change. Mr. Wald wants to identify the priorities for the BAC in the 2040 plan. Mr. Wald moves for a technical subcommittee for January 16<sup>th</sup> 6-8pm. Mr. Stanton seconds. Motion passes.
- **Discussion and Possible Action-** – Anchor Lane – Mr. Stanton introduces Anchor Lane as the road near Contigo Restaurant and 38<sup>th</sup> and a half. People were parking in the bike lane and parking was added to the street. Mr. Wilkes explains that Contigo approached

the Bicycle Program with a request to add parking and they paid for the changes. The parking modification process was not initiated since the bicycle lane remained. There is a 7' parking lane and a 6' bicycle lane. Ms. Benner would like to know why there is not a floating parking lane. Mr. Wilkes explains that there was not have enough space to do so safely. Mr. Leblanc asks if people were parking on both sides of the bike lane. Mr. Jarnagin confirms that they were. Mr. Kopper got complaints about parking in bike lane and added no parking signs. Parking continued and resulted in this change.

Mr. McFadden asks whether a 2-way cycle track was considered. Mr. Wilkes responds that this was an acute parking problem of a quarter mile of an existing section. Mr. Jarnagin asks if this will set a precedent for other businesses to ask for special parking requirements. Mr. Wilkes said that we entertained this change because it solved the issue of parking in the bike lane. Mr. Wald thinks that the BAC reached a consensus that 13' was too narrow for a bicycle lane and parking in the past. Mr. Kopper clarifies that the discussion in the past was on a 12' combination of parking/bicycle lane. **Mr. Jarnagin moves that the Bicycle Program bring any combination of parking/bicycle lane less than 14' for consultation to the BAC before implementing them. Mr. Thayer seconds the motion. Motion passes.**

#### **4. Items from staff – 6:40-7:30**

- **Briefing and Possible Action** – Bike Share Update – Mr. McFadden introduces bike share. It has been 2 years since CAMPO voted to use federal funds for the project which were matched by local funding to put a 40 station system on the ground. The first phase is 11 stations and the full system will be in place by SXSW. There is a ceremony at 11<sup>th</sup> and Congress this Saturday with music and food for the launch. Day memberships are \$8, annual memberships are \$80. Mr. Leblanc asks if we have the flexibility to rearrange stations to different locations. Mr. McFadden explains that they are modular, mobile stations but moving them is expensive. The bike share locations were chosen based on the most highly ranked stations from the public input process. Mr. Jarnagin asks if you could ride to/from San Antonio. Mr. McFadden says that you could ride to San Antonio but the bike would lock down there. However, there is a reciprocity agreement with San Antonio so if you were an annual member you would be able to use the system there. Mr. Murphy asks if there are plans in the works for the next phase beyond the current 40. Mr. McFadden says that they are focusing on these stations and that they are required by their grant funding to operate only between Oltorf and 24<sup>th</sup> Streets. They are looking to expand but Mr. McFadden cannot comment further at this time.
- **Briefing and Possible Action** – Mueller Neighborhood Bicycle Facilities –Mr. Wilkes presents Mueller Boulevard and Berkman which are both in the process of being upgraded to cycletracks. Additionally, there was a traffic calming request for Zach Scott, and a 2-way cycletrack was considered which would lead to an elementary school. Zach Scott is a main cross street through the Mueller neighborhood. The cycletrack will be separated by a planted median. The portion west of Berkman has not been funded. Mr. Murphy asks about the bulb outs on Berkman and Mr. Wilkes explains that we have offered design guidance. Tilley, parallel to the east of Berkman, may include two-way

cycle tracks. There is a scenario with two, two-way cycle tracks crossing on Zach Scott and Tilley. Mr. Wilkes explains that it's an 8-way stop. It is suggested that car turn radii be tightened. Mr. Leblanc comments that this may be confusing since the de-facto 4-way stop interchange has changed so that normally east/west movements go together and the north/south movements follow instead of yielding to the right. Mr. Wilkes gives background that the developers wanted to end the 2-way cycletracks before the intersection to avoid confusion.

Mr. Wilkes shows the roundabout of Aldrich Street and Mueller Boulevard. The roundabout was a potential location that urban rail alignment could pass through and therefore bicycles would not want to be there. Mr. Wilkes explains that this is a retrofit and not being built from scratch. Mr. Thayer asks if bicycles yield to cars in the crossing. Mr. Wilkes explains that bicycles have the right of way because otherwise it would be difficult to cross. Mr. Wald is disappointed that the cycletrack on Barton Springs bumps around utility poles and wants to know if this will be the same case. Mr. Wilkes says that there are utility boxes where the bikelane/sidewalk squeezes down to 8'. Mr. Wald asks if we can lump the moving of the utility box into the project. Mr. Wilkes says that we haven't looked specifically at this concept. Mr. Leblanc notes that as a cyclist you would never have to stop in the roundabout and Mr. Wilkes confirms, unless you are yielding to other bikes. Mr. Stanton asks if we think that bikes will bike contraflow in the sidewalk. Mr. Wilkes explains that it is not designed for that movement. C.M. Riley asks why there isn't a roundabout in the first intersection that was shown. Mr. Wilkes says that there was a time constraint and he thinks that this is the best we could get under the circumstances. Mr. Leblanc likes it. Mr. Anderson likes the intersecting cycletracks more than a roundabout. Mr. Stanton asks what the yield rules are in light of trying to keep a group of kids together because the cycletrack will be feeding a school. Mr. Wilkes says that there is the potential for exploring stop controls in the future. Mr. Wilkes explained that the engineers who are responsible for this project were comfortable with the 4-way stop approach. C.M. Riley thinks that a Dutch intersection could be more place-making than the current approach which is not as impressive; it could be a landmark. Mr. Wald asks about Tilley and Manor precluding an all-ages crossing. Mr. Wilkes suggests that this is very close to what we are trying to achieve as a safe crossing. Mr. Leblanc suggests that in the future this could warrant a signal.

**Mr. Thayer moves that the BAC approve the Aldrich street roundabout bike geometry and the concepts for the 8-way, two-way cycletrack intersection on Tilley and Zach Scott as well as completing the cycle track on Tilley to Manor. The BAC also looks forward to all-ages and abilities connections on Manor Road to Tilley. Mr. Eden seconds. The motion passes.**

- **Discussion and Possible Action** – Loop 360 Rumble Strips and Ramp Improvements

Ms. Chapman presents notion of using profile markings (not rumble strips) along arterials. Mr. Stanton suggests using a trial location. Mr. Thayer suggests that if these are installed they should be discontinued where cyclists will cross. Mr. Leblanc proposes that test site is on a steep downhill to test high speed effect on cyclists. Ms. Chapman states that S. Lamar is a

potential test site. BAC questions if S. Lamar is steep enough to test. Mr. Wilkes has steep bicycle lanes on Far West. Mr. Murphy suggests Banister at the crossing of the watershed. BAC supports. BAC is interested in potential application if S. Lamar and 360 tests are successful.

Ms. Benner moves to have the BAC supports a test of profile markings on a steep section of road. Mr. Hilde seconds. The motion passes.

Mr. Kopper presents possible designs for ramps along 360. Mr. Kopper proposes increasing refuge area space thus increasing the number of short crossing opportunities. A second option is to have a wrap around option crossing at a sharper angle instead. Mr. Stanton worries that recreational riders will not use a wrap around. Mr. Murphy says that people used to riding on 360 may not use the wrap around but people who are less used to the transition may benefit from this wrap around. Mr. Murphy thinks that the confident cyclists will already have moved over before they would benefit from the extended bicycle lane/refuge. Mr. Eden asks if there could be a green lane. Mr. Kopper doesn't think that cyclists could impose a yield condition. A small hill could give cyclists doing the wrap around more speed to get across the crossing. Mr. Wald suggests that this matter be brought to the attention of the Travis County Bicycle Safety Task Force. Mr. Wilkes says that we have a known case history of fatalities at these ramps and we need to make changes. Mr. Murphy says that 360 is now being used as a commuter route instead of Bee Caves.

- **Discussion and Possible Action**— Bicycle Program Year in Review —Mr. Kopper presents the project review with a list of complete projects as well as completed barriers in 2013. Roughly 20 miles of new bicycle lanes and 20 improved bicycle lanes. BAC requests that the list of complete projects be sent to the BAC. The BAC suggests that promoting the list of completed projects could be a tool to get people excited about biking in Austin.

## **5. Announcements/Adjourn –**

Traffic Management Center is open for the BAC this Thursday. See announcement on BAC group. Allison Kaplan – 183 North Project brief. Project limits between SH45 and 183 with transition zone south to 2222. Open house on Jan 28<sup>th</sup>. More details at January BAC meeting.

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