

Bicycle Advisory Committee Meeting

Minutes

December 5, 2007
10:00 am to 11:30 am
Room 225, City Hall

Agenda

1. Introductions, Sign-in, and Approval of Previous Month's Minutes (10:00-10:05)
2. 54th Street Reconstruction Project (10:05-10:20) – Jeff Handeland
 - Presentation of layout (includes bike lanes)
 - Pervious pavement treatments
 - BAC discussionMinneapolis Bicycle Master Plan - Goals and Policy Framework
3. Discussion (10:20-11:25)
4. Lunch at 11:30 – Pizza and Pop

Attendees

Attendee	Representing
Richard Anderson	Loring Park Neighborhood
Billy Binder	Hennepin County Bicycle Advisory Committee
Dan Brevia	Seward Neighborhood
Chris Budel	St Paul Bike Advisory Board
Robin Garwood	City Councilmember Cam Gordon
Roy Hallenger	Minneapolis Public Schools
Jeff Handeland	Minneapolis Public Works Engineering Services
Carl Johnson	Loring Park Neighborhood
Tim Kremer	Bottineau Neighborhood
Janis Lysen	Resident
Nick Mason	DERO Bike Rack Company
Shaun Murphy	Minneapolis Public Works Bicycle Program
Jennifer Ringold	Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board (Substitute BAC Chair)
Everett Schell	Resident
Rachel Speck	Standish-Ericsson Neighborhood
Benjamin Tsai	Hub Bike Co-op
Mackenzie Turner	Minneapolis Transportation Management Organization
Georgianna Yantos	Hawthorne Neighborhood

Approval of Previous Month's Minutes

Jennifer Ringold presented the meeting minutes from the previous month. Shaun Murphy explained where the minutes would be housed on the City's website.

Committee discussion included the following:

- Carl Johnson asked about the wording of the BAC motion from last month – was the trial period for the 2nd & Marquette Avenue transit-bike lanes for a full year, and was Nick's requirement included?
- Shaun read the motion which was sent to the Mayor and City Council.
- Jennifer asked that the motion wording be added to the minutes.
- Richard Anderson clarified that he was not saying that a decision regarding a trial of the dual use transit-bike lane on 2nd/Marquette should not be made promptly. Rather, the long-term decision should be based off of the 6-month trial.
- Roy Hallenger noted that following his comments on page 4, Don Pflaum had made a comment saying that the Great River Energy Bicycle Festival should be able to continue on Nicollet Mall in its present location.
- Carl mentioned that regarding his comment on page 4, he did not recall saying that he agreed with Peter Wagenius' previous comment. Rather he made the statement on his own.
- Billy Binder recalled that Peter made the statement that the removal of the bike lanes was a deliberative process. Billy said that he had then later said that it was not a deliberative process.

A motion was made to approve the minutes, it was seconded, and they were approved on a voice vote.

54th Street Reconstruction Project

Jennifer introduced Jeff Handeland from the Transportation Planning & Engineering Services Division of the Minneapolis Public Works Department. He gave the following presentation regarding the reconstruction of 54th Street W:

54th Street will be reconstructed between Upton and Penn Avenues next year. The project is approximately ¼ mile in length. Bike lanes are included in the project since they were in the City's Bicycle Master Plan. On-street parking is being reduced from both sides to one side (the south side of the street will retain parking). To add bike lanes, some green space had to be removed from the original plans. Since the City is trying to minimize the impervious area on the streets that feed into Minnehaha Creek, the possibility of constructing some parts of the street using pervious pavement is being explored. The Public Works Department would like some input on what it would be like to ride a bike on a pervious surface. Only portions of the street surface need to be pervious. The critical areas are in the gutters. The drive lanes wouldn't make much sense since they are nearer to the crown of the roadway. The City's tentative plans for pervious pavement include the parking area on the south and the gutter area on the north, which would be 5 feet wide for use as a bike lane. Joints would be roughly every 10 to 15 feet, to minimize random cracking.

Jeff passed around a pervious pavement sample. Committee discussion included the following:

- Rachel Speck asked how the pervious pavement holds up to cracking.
- Jeff replied that it's a fairly new and preliminary material, but it seems to hold up so far. It does have less strength since the fine sands have been removed, however. The likelihood of potholes might be greater. At 10th Avenue near Lake Street there is a cul-de-sac which is made out of pervious pavement, which can be ridden on for a real-life experience. One benefit for cyclists is that water seeps in, in the winter a cyclist wouldn't have as much ice – once it melts it goes right through and wouldn't refreeze on the surface.
- Rachel followed up by asking if the pervious pavement holds up under plowing.
- Jeff replied that it does not hold up as well as impervious pavement.
- Roy asked how the pavement lives through the freeze/thaw cycle.
- Jeff said that this could be a problem, especially if the pores get clogged. Public Works is going to buy a vacuum street sweeper to keep the pores clear.
- Dan Breva asked if 54th Street is a bus route.
- Jeff replied that it is not.
- Dan followed up by asking if the pavement would be deep.
- Jeff said that the pavement section, including a base layer of clear rock, would be about 3 feet deep.
- Richard commented that he isn't sure how many cyclists ride on 54th Street, but that it might be a good test spot since presumably there are not many.
- Chris Budel asked if the City has considered pavers, which while not pervious, have cracks and are very smooth and flat.
- Jeff replied that he had heard of this, but would have to consider the cost of materials and labor.
- Chris pointed out that with bricks you only replace the pavement in certain areas if there is a small problem – the City would not have to replace entire street sections.
- Carl Johnson expressed that asphalt without a seal coat is ideal for smoothness, and that this would not be ideal.
- Roy thought cyclists might ride out in the drive lane if they didn't like the pervious surface, but he agreed that this would be a good pilot.
- Richard said that one great advantage of this pavement is that it is great for the environment.
- Carl thought that the pervious pavement could possibly be planed, so that it was not as rough as the sample.
- Jeff replied that he would look into that possibility.
- Jennifer shared that the Minneapolis Park Board recently put in pervious pavement in Edgewater Park on a sidewalk, as an experiment.
- Chris asked if the vacuum on the street sweeper would be used in the winter.
- Jeff said he did not know the frequency of the street sweeping.
- Janis Lysen mentioned that pervious pavement has been a topic of discussion on the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals listserv, and it might be a good idea to read that discussion.
- Jeff shared that the City might have to consider doing a one foot gutter on the right side of the bike lane, since the slip form cannot be done with the pervious concrete material.

- Richard replied that he did not think a one foot gutter was a big issue. He then asked if the material could be colored in green, for example.
- Jeff said that there are a couple ways to color concrete, and he would explore it.
- Richard said that the advantage would then be that it would be obvious where the pervious pavement was.
- Tim Kremer expressed that the one foot gutter would be where the pedals were anyways, and that a cyclist should not be that close to the curb.
- Richard asked if this pervious pavement bike lane could be designated as a test project.
- Jeff said that by its nature it would be.
- Richard replied that if Public Works could actually evaluate it and ask cyclists for feedback, it would be useful.
- Dan thought that the gutter could be less than one foot – perhaps 8 or 10”, like the streets in the St. Anthony Main neighborhood.

Jennifer summarized that the committee sentiment is that the idea is not a bad one, with some concerns about how rough the pavement is. She also suggested that evaluation is a desire from the group. Jeff added that there is a chance that pervious pavement might not be used at all, but that he appreciated feedback from the committee.

Minneapolis Bicycle Master Plan - Goals and Policy Framework Discussion

Jennifer introduced the Bicycle Master Plan item, and Shaun explained the context of the Goals and Policy Framework document in relation to the Bicycle Master Plan Outline (presented at the November BAC meeting). The Goals and Policy Framework is one of approximately six sections within the Bicycle Master Plan, which Don is developing.

Jennifer then asked for feedback on the new document. She began by asking Shaun a few background questions:

- Was the Bicycle Master Plan an action item in the Access Minneapolis plan? Yes.
- Are the policy statements within the Goals and Policy Framework handout new or from another document? They are all new.

Committee discussion included the following:

- Carl asked if the policies already exist.
- Jennifer replied that none of them are in existence.
- Dan thought that the document was a good place to start, but that it would be wise to use the policies as a vision or as guiding principles. The policies could always be recommended to the City Council, but they may be more useful as a vision.
- Robin thought that some of these are not higher level policies, rather they are more “rubber meets the road.” For example, a policy of maintenance funding matching new projects does not seem like a vision for the future. A one-paragraph vision, separate from the policies, would be useful.
- Roy noticed that the policies are scattered and he believed it was hard to look at the big picture.
- Robin asked Roy if he would split the document into areas for City of Minneapolis action, Hennepin County action, Minneapolis Public Schools action, etc.
- Roy replied that would help.

- Chris asked how realistic these policies are. For example, would Minneapolis Public Schools allow biking everywhere?
- Roy supposed that eventually it would happen.
- Jennifer wondered if there is already support for such a policy, or if the policy is pushing the envelope.
- Georgianna shared that she has personally experienced that Policy #3 (Maintenance and operations funding must be secured before a project can be constructed.), is a major issue for Public Works. For example the way finding sign contract between the Hawthorne neighborhood and Public Works is on hold because of lack of maintenance funding. A policy that stops things from going forward, like the W 54th Street bike lanes, might not be a good one.
- Jennifer shared that she had also flagged Policy #3, because it could hold back creativity. She thought there might be a better way to write it. Maintenance issues can't be ignored, but we also can't ignore new projects.
- Robin said that new capital and maintenance aren't connected in the decision making process. The City is not keeping pace on many things, like standard renovations of streets that would extend their life. It seems odd to single out bikes with this issue.
- Tim said that on 18th Avenue in Northeast, there is an easement for the bike path, but it's held up and he does not think a maintenance problem should stop all work.

Jennifer asked the committee to specifically comment on page 1. Committee discussion included the following:

- Robin thought there should be a vision – what will biking in Minneapolis look like.
- Jennifer thought the vision in the Comprehensive Plan and the Access Minneapolis Plan should be captured in the Bicycle Master Plan vision.
- Jan thought there should be a simple vision or goal, like Portland's bicycle mode share goals. This would be inspiring.
- Tim thought the purpose list was too verbose, and there needed to be a simple purpose.
- Roy agreed that there needed to be an overarching simple goal.
- Chris thought a simple goal might dumb it down. He thought it was a good plan to digest.
- Tim replied that he did not disagree with Chris, but he thought the purpose needed to be more concise. The purposes listed could actually be objectives within the plan.
- Chris expressed that the purpose should be to get more people to ride bikes, period.
- Richard said the BAC role needs to be "strengthened" instead of "reevaluated." Otherwise, it would make it sound like the BAC has no purpose, and he thought it already did.
- Rachel suggested that instead of saying "To encourage the use of innovative treatments when necessary," it should say, "where feasible or possible."
- Richard thought bicyclists should be encouraging environmental innovation regarding infrastructure improvement. The City's sustainability goals should also be included in the Bicycle Master Plan.
- Robin agreed that the City's sustainability goals should be flagged. Those which are affected by the Bicycle Master Plan should be explicitly tied to objectives.
- Jennifer thought there should be a whole section on how the Bicycle Master Plan relates to other city documents.
- Carl wondered if committee members could have a Word document of this draft.
- Jennifer thought that the document was far from detailed editing, so this might not be necessary.
- Richard thought neighborhood bike plans should be examined.
- Jennifer agreed that a group of committee members should work on reviewing other documents, including neighborhood plans.
- Roy thought that it would be helpful to see a graphic representation showing where the Bicycle Master Plan fits into the City's sustainability guidelines, comprehensive plan, etc.

- Robin thought other groups should be asked to look at this plan and review it before it is adopted.

Jennifer asked the committee to move on to page 2, and she suggested that the committee look at the organization of the draft, more than the detail at the current time. Committee discussion included the following:

- Jennifer thought this page was very important.
- Jan asked about benchmarks – perhaps Minneapolis should be compared to other cities, so that we can be compared to the outside.
- Jennifer shared that she uses benchmarks more to reflect best practices, but she agreed that Jan’s definition made sense too. She asked if the benchmarks are feasible compared to other cities.
- Nick mentioned that the Thunderhead Alliance’s 2007 Benchmarking Report would be a good reference to use.
- Robin did not think that the City had the ability to do a lot of performance measuring. Perhaps that would need to be an objective, since there currently is not much ability.
- Jennifer suggested adding an explanation of how the policies relate to the other pieces of the Bicycle Master plan. A hierarchy should be described.
- Rachel suggested adding the word “collaboration” under the partnership section.
- Robin suggested appointing a lead agency to each one of the objectives.
- Roy suggested that the definitions include who would be asked to carry a task forth, or to list out things which would be asked of certain organizations or people.

The committee moved on to page 3:

- Dan wondered if the numbers for crashes were going to be based on a ratio, per miles driven, etc. If Minneapolis had more bicyclists there might be more crashes.
- Tim thought that if Minneapolis is going to have a safer environment, there would have more tickets, not fewer.
- Shaun thought that following rules of the road should be based on observed compliance rates, rather than on tickets.
- Roy said we should work with diverse communities, related to safety, enforcement, tourism, etc. The effort should be widely encompassing.
- Rachel pointed out that “reaching all communities” was on the first page, but she thought that there needed to be more specifics within the whole plan.
- Jennifer thought that diversity could be addressed in a policy.
- Ben thought there should be education of cyclists and cops, since cops do not always know laws, and since there are cops who are too aggressive.
- Chris said that most laws are simple – most bicyclists know they can’t run stoplights.
- Ben replied that the “double abreast riding” law is more confusing.
- Rachel thought there were other issues around enforcement, like “dooring.”
- Chris suggested there be a class available that is an option in lieu of a ticket, to teach about bicycle-related laws.
- Dan thought there should be a piece of enforcement education for the enforcement community.
- Robin replied that that could go under 3a.
- Rachel suggested 3a go under 3c, since education should be the first focus.
- Richard asked if there were questions on the exam for drivers’ licenses.
- Nick and Dan replied that there are some, but they don’t always come up in each individual exam.
- Richard said that he was referring more to driver’s education classes.
- Jennifer thought that some of the suggestions were too specific for this document. Some of them were more relevant as an action step. She suggested asking if a suggestion fits under an objective.

- Dan thought 3b should be worded as a “comprehensive transportation education program.”
- Jennifer wondered if this document could influence something like that, or if it belongs in another document. She suggested that the committee ask Don to answer that question. She questioned whether other modes could be influenced in this document.
- Georgianna wondered if the Bicycle Master Plan could support a hierarchy of pedestrians first, bicyclists second, public transportation third, and private vehicles fourth.
- Robin thought it would be good if the Bicycle Master Plan made recommendations about other modes of transportation, in order to reach goals for biking. He also thought there should be a separate education section for bus and truck drivers.
- Ben said that there is underreporting of bike crashes, and it should be addressed in the crash section.
- Robin agreed.
- Billy thought the Chamber of Commerce should be added to the bicycle education partnership, since they are so interested in this issue.

The committee moved on to pages 5 and 6:

- Robin suggested that community and public destinations be defined. He wondered what the difference was. He also thought it should be identified as to whether total numbers of trips should be measured versus percentages. There also is not good information on bicycle thefts.
- Nick thought that the suggested percentages for bicycle theft reduction are too high.
- Robin thought it should say thefts per bicyclist, so it would not be skewed by increased bicycle mode share.
- Nick said that objective #2 was too low. Many cities are shooting for 6-10% mode share by 2010. Minneapolis would be behind.
- Jennifer said that Don thought the 15% by 2015 goal was too aggressive. He was trying to be more realistic. She wondered if those other cities would meet those goals.
- Nick said he knew that Portland will be putting in 100 miles of bike boulevards in the next few years.
- Chris thought mode share should be a public goal, and if Minneapolis goes beyond it that will look great.
- Tim suggested that 4%, 8%, and 12% are better goals to have.
- Robin thought it would be helpful to policymakers to have loftier goals than 4%, 5%, and 6%. They wouldn't be as likely to invest if the mode share goals were too low.
- Roy suggested that if Minneapolis had the goal of becoming the best biking city in the country, it might provide guidance for some of the goals.
- Jan thought that mode share could be a primary goal, to get overall results.
- Rachel said that objective 5b was grasping at straws. She expressed she was not sure of a good way of reaching an objective around obesity.
- Robin mentioned that the City's sustainability indicators could be of use in this section, since Minneapolis already has obesity goals.
- Rachel wondered how we would reach that goal in relation to biking.
- Tim agreed and thought that it was a goal for the City's Health Department.
- Chris disagreed, and said he thought it was a great goal.
- Jennifer said that the Park Board is trying to use the health issue, to educate the public know that parks are a resource for reducing obesity. She thought biking could be tied in as well. It's another way to promote biking.
- Rachel thought then the responsibility in that section should reflect the City's Health Department.
- Robin suggested under 4b that Meet Minneapolis could help Minneapolis get a better performance measure than packets distributed.

- Nick said that there are resources out there to help with bicycle tourism. Wisconsin has some good information.
- Robin said that under 3b, a benchmark needs to reflect schools and community groups.

The committee moved on to pages 7 and 8:

- Rachel thought benchmark 1a should be reworded. She suggested saying, “Establish by 2010 and maintain through 2020.”
- Robin and Roy said that the responsibility section under 1a should have more agencies, and one agency should be established as a lead.
- Roy said that non-public and charter schools should be included.
- Robin said Policy #2 should say “encourage” instead of “allow.”
- Jennifer thought Policy #2 should be written in school board language. She wondered what documents at the school it should relate to.
- Roy said 1c should have Community Education Department under responsibility.
- Rachel added that libraries should be included.
- Robin said that “sufficiency of racks on buses and trains” should be defined. Are 2 racks on the front of a bus sufficient? Also, 1b should include LRT stations and possible streetcar stops.
- Mackenzie said “opt-outs” should be called “suburban operators” instead.
- Roy said that the cost of free parking should be considered – businesses should not charge cyclists for the cost of parking. There should be some sort of incentive to have customers come by bicycle or transit.
- Chris said that snow removal should be considered under infrastructure.
- Jennifer asked Shaun to e-mail the document out to committee members.
- Billy suggested that the committee finish reviewing the document at the next meeting.
- Shaun suggested that committee members could send further comments via e-mail.

Next Meeting

Wednesday, January 2nd, 10:00 am, Room 220 City Hall