



MINUTES
MANHATTAN BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
City Commission Room, City Hall
1101 Poyntz Ave, Manhattan, KS 66502
October 20, 2011

Members Present: Dan Scott, Diane Novak, Ben Champion, Dave Colburn, Joe Wright, Joe Edmunds, Brian Hardeman, Michael Wesch

Members Absent: Susanne Kufahl

Staff Present: Joey Lightner, Bicycle Intern; Peter Clark, Design Engineer; Rob Ott, City Engineer; Curt Loupe, Director of Parks and Recreation; Karen Davis, Director of Community Development; Lance Evans, Long-Range Planner

Public Attendance: 5

B. Hardeman called the meeting to order at 4:33 p.m. on October 20th, 2011

1. Approve minutes from September 2011.
 - a. B. Champion moved to approve the September 2011 minutes with corrections. The motion was seconded by J. Edmunds. The motion passed 7-0.
2. Staff Reports
 - a. J. Lightner reported on driver's educational posters. D. Novak and J. Lightner posted material at the local Division of Motor Vehicles office, driving school and Riley County Treasurer's Office.
 - b. J. Lightner also reported on the Bike Week Committee. The Committee met to develop a calendar of events for bike week. Additionally, bike week will be from April 29th-May 5th, 2012. The calendar of events will be posted on Bikemanhattan.com at a later date.
 - c. P. Clark reported on the intersection of Hays and Casement. The intersection is being expanded to the south. Linear trail connects to the intersection. Sidewalk will be present along the length of the project but not beyond due to storm water drainage issues. D. Novak asked if CDBG funds could be used for this project. R. Ott stated that to solve the storm water issues would cost more than the project allowed. P. Clark stated that this is a possible future project for the city. R. Ott stated that the ditch is utilized for storm water run-off. P. Clark stated that six-foot sidewalks would be needed due to the traffic volume and speeds and to move the ditch over would be complicated and a significant investment in infrastructure. R. Ott stated that Knox Lane has the same issue. P. Clark stated the intersection would have two new ADA compliant ramps and a striped crosswalk allowing for better pedestrian access.

3. CDBG Funds

- a. B. Hardeman introduced Curt Loupe, Director of Parks and Recreation and Karen Davis, Director of Community Development. K. Davis reported on the role of Community Development and CDBG funding. She stated that CDBG funds are limited to low and moderate income census blocks. One project that was to be accomplished this year is the sidewalk in City Park to allow bike access through the park. Additionally, CDBG funds for this year are planned for CASA, The Douglass Center, and other services. The funding for sidewalks will be limited. B. Champion asked what the budget was for CDBG. K. Davis reported that it is \$470,000 and the department is expecting that it will be decreased. Additionally, there are several resources that are paid for by this funding to include staff and other services. P. Clark mentioned that this funding could be used for sidewalks in some neighborhoods. B. Hardeman inquired about how to best provide input for priorities of CDBG funds. K. Davis stated that the best way to provide input is by funneling comments through staff. She also mentioned that there will be meetings for public input on Oct 26th at 6:00pm at City Hall and Oct 27th at 10:00am at the Manhattan Library. P. Clark stated that staff would create a map of sidewalk gaps and potential CDBG census blocks. B. Hardeman also stated that funds can be used for connectivity of low income to retail and commercial areas. K. Davis stated that Community Development would have to show benefit to those of low income. B. Hardeman mentioned the area around Walmart and Fort Riley Boulevard as possible locations. K. Davis stated that a door-to-door survey can be conducted to assess income levels in areas that are not listed as low to moderate income census blocks. In the end, the City Commission decides how the funds are best spent.

4. Moro Bike Study

- a. J. Lightner presented on the Moro Bike Study. The full presentation can be accessed by email. The committee discussed potential mechanisms to describe behavior. However, J. Lightner reminded the committee that this is only a cross-sectional study and results are only to be used as a baseline for future longitudinal measures.
- b. The committee began discussion of possible bike traffic patterns in conjunction with a bike boulevard on Moro. P. Clark stated that bike lanes on 11th would be good as the road is 31 feet wide, allowing for a 4-foot bike lane on each side. B. Champion stated that turning left onto 11th would be difficult with current traffic. He asked if an eight-foot sidewalk would be better. He also stated that bike lanes on 11th are good even with the sidewalk. B. Hardeman stated that a contra-flow bike lane on north Manhattan would be a long-term solution to reduce the number of bikes on the sidewalk. P. Clark stated that a contra-flow bike lane should be separated from traffic with some kind of buffer.

5. Year-End Report

- a. J. Lightner reported that the BAC needs to submit a year end report to the City Manager's Office. P. Clark stated that goals of the next year should include applying to the League of American Bicyclists as a Bicycle-Friendly Community, educational opportunities and community participation. B. Champion stated that a goal should include strengthening the relationship with city departments and other advisory boards. M. Wesch stated that a goal should be to have the best bike week ever. B. Hardeman stated that community input

should be sought. P. Clark stated that feedback from Community Planning and Parks and Recreation should be continued. R. Ott stated that a goal should be to implement the CIP projects. B. Hardeman asked that a draft be circulated within a week.

6. City Committee & Boards Meeting

- a. P. Clark discussed the purpose of the BAC, in which the BAC acts as advisory board to the City Commission and as an advocacy group for bicycling issues. B. Hardeman stated that department heads and chairs of committees should be invited to certain meetings like they have been today. B. Champion stated that he believes there is a lack of communication on projects. Additionally, he would like to be more proactive so that the BAC can plan accordingly. He suggested having an annual meeting for all departments to present current projects. This would allow the BAC to incorporate bikes into existing projects and thus fix the problem. B. Hardeman stated that this process is already happening by inviting staff to meetings and presenting to other boards. This could be improved by reading the annual report from the City Manager's Office. K. Davis stated that the BAC could read the monthly report as it is accessible online. B. Champion stated that information flow is disrupted citing projects, reports and lists as information that he did not know about. P. Clark suggested having three (3) BAC meetings devoted to presentations from Public Works, Park and Recreation and Community Development. B. Hardeman inquired about an executive summary that these boards might report. P. Clark asked which meeting months would be best for hearing from other city departments. K. Davis stated that the CIP process usually begins in October or November and input is received in February from the public. She stated that staff could present upcoming CIP ideas in October or November for the budget of the following year. P. Clark suggested having Community Development present CIP projects in November. C. Loupe cited the Zoo Education Center as a possible missed opportunity. R. Ott stated that CIP requests should be made in February or March of every year. K. Davis stated that the budget is approved in August. B. Champion suggested devoting September, October and November to CIP details and the summer months to events and sitting in on budget meetings.

7. Bike Sharing Program – Liam Reilly

- a. L. Reilly discussed the possibility of creating a bike sharing program within Manhattan. He stated that Student Governing Association has suggested that some money might be available for such a program. He reported on other communities that have bike sharing programs and the success of such programs. M. Wesch asked about costs for bikes. L. Reilly showed a video of a successful bike rental program and stated that a bike sharing program would connect campus with the surrounding community. He requested feedback on where bikes should be located and how many would be sufficient. He also reported that an option would be to create a "Yellow Bike Program," where bike are free to use and painted a bright color to bring awareness. He stated the advantages and disadvantages of each program, noting the cost-effectiveness of such programs. J. Wright inquired about maintenance of the bikes. L. Reilly stated that a community bike shop usually maintains bikes. M. Wesch reported on a different bike sharing program, Free Cycles. This program would allow people to get a free bike if they donate time to help repair bikes. B. Champion

stated that these bikes are usually single-speed bikes and the program does lose money but increases awareness and gets local residents excited about bicycling. D. Scott inquired about the abandoned bikes around the dorms and if they could be used for this purpose. B. Champion stated that removal of private property is complicated due to state and local laws. B. Hardeman stated that possible locations for bike sharing could include: the Pathfinder, Big Poppi, the north end redevelopment and Claflin and College. He stated that the goal would be to first increase ridership and suggested starting small (i.e. around campus). M. Wesch reported on the bike sharing program in Missoula, Montana. J. Wright suggested asking that the police department donate bikes that have been removed because they have been abandoned. B. Champion inquired about current bike rental programs on campus. L. Reilly stated that students can rent bikes for a semester or year at a time from the recreation center and other entities. B. Hardeman suggested created a program like a vacation rental, where students could rent bikes for a weekend. L. Reilly stated that the current recreation center renovation does not allow for any storage space for bikes. B. Champion inquired about right-of-way and city regulations. R. Ott stated that if racks are placed on individual property than of course those individual property owners would need to be consulted and if placed on city right-of-way then they must be ADA compliant. M. Wesch stated the cost-benefit of Free Cycles, noting that \$25,000 would buy 100 bikes compared to 5. D. Scott inquired if a parking spot could be used for bike parking. J. Edmunds suggested that hotels might give up one parking spot for a bike rack. M. Wesch stated that the overall collective rack space would be important for a Free Cycle program. B. Champion inquired about being stranded because someone else took your bike. B. Hardeman stated that the reason programs like this work in other cities is because they have other modes of transportation. M. Wesch stated that unfortunately bikes will replace walking trips.

8. Bike Racks

- a. J. Lightner requested feedback on bike rack location and how to best engage the public for feedback. D. Novak suggested putting something in the water bill. R. Ott suggested putting it on the website. The following sites were suggested: Bluestem Bistro, near Kinko's on Anderson Ave, near the Wefald Pavilion, Cico Park, City Park and Pool, Splash Park and Playground, the Stone House, the Farmer's Market and Courthouse. P. Clark suggested after getting a list that the committee reconvene to prioritize locations. R. Ott suggested contacting Downtown Manhattan Inc to incorporate bike racks into redevelopment.

9. Work Session to Discuss Bike Master Plan

- a. B. Hardeman reported on the past work session. He stated that a portion of the BMP has been adopted in the Manhattan Area Transportation Strategy. He stated that the goal of updating biking policy would be to recommend an updated version of the plan to incorporate maps and to build on what we have already done. He stated that the next step is to define goals then to have public feedback. D. Colburn asked city staff what the role of the BMP is, stated that it has been adopted and ignored. He inquired in the value of the BMP and if Chapter 8 of the MATS is enough. B. Champion stated that one charge of the advisory committee is to update the BMP. P. Clark stated that because bike philosophies

are fluid, the BMP should be more general in nature. B. Hardeman stated that the BMP should focus on potential future connections and be updated every 10 years. P. Clark suggested making a fluid map and make the CIP request separate. B. Hardeman stated that the 5-year CIP request has done that. B. Hardeman inquired about having Community Development writing the plan. K. Davis stated the BAC should write the plan. While Community Development can help, the BAC should actually write the document. B. Hardeman inquired about when the Comprehensive Plan is updated. P. Clark stated that the BAC could lean on Community Development to formalize the plan. B. Hardeman inquired about the formal adoption process. K. Davis stated the timeline for adoption and the process that is involved. R. Ott inquired about how the committee wants the document to be used, stated that it is easier to argue with developers when there is policy in writing. B. Hardeman stated there needs to be a larger document that is the vision of the group. B. Champion inquired about what would be easier to pass, a new BMP or a change to the MATS. K. Davis stated that the process is very similar. B. Hardeman inquired when the MATS will be updated next. K. Davis stated that it needs to be updated but it is a \$200,000 project. L. Evans suggested doing something before the MATS update. K. Davis suggested adopting an amendment to Chapter 8 of the MATS. B. Hardeman suggested drafting a simpler version of the BMP and revisions to Chapter 8 of the MATS. M. Wesch stated that, as of now, Chapter 8 has no real enforceable properties. K. Davis stated the importance of community involvement. She also noted the importance of a timeline. B. Hardeman asked the BAC to meet again at work session on November 3rd at 4:30 to discuss updates further.

Meeting adjourned at 6:40 pm

Next meeting: November 17th, 2011