MINUTES BICYCLE USERS SUBCOMMITTEE

City Hall - Council Conference Room Wednesday, November 20, 2013 - 5:00 p.m.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gene Hiegel, Chair Beth Trimble, Vice Chair Jane Rands Vince Buck Karla Reinhardt John Carroll

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Matt Leslie

STAFF PRESENT:

Jay Eastman, Senior Planner

OTHERS PRESENT:

None

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Hiegel at 5:07 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no members of the public present.

MINUTES

MOTION made by Member Carroll SECONDED by Member Reinhardt to approve the minutes of October 16, 2013 with the following grammar corrections: change "instilled" to "installed" on page 2, 1st paragraph, 5th line; on page 2, 5th paragraph, change to read as: "Member Leslie asked if there will be signs at the train station…"; on page 3, 2nd paragraph "indicated" instead of "indicted" and "were" instead of "was"; on page 3, 1st paragraph, change "Eastman" from "He" to identify who developed a list of sharrow streets, and make a similar change to "Eastman" wherein it says "he added sharrows to Nutwood…". APPROVED 4-0, with members Rands and Buck abstaining because they did not attend the October meeting.

REGULAR BUSINESS

1. OCTA BikeLink Pilot Project

Senior Planner Eastman gave an update of the BikeLink Pilot Project. He said the system is still under Beta testing and OCTA is inspecting the equipment before taking ownership. Eastman provided details of the funding, inspections, testing and status. Eastman explained how the City is only a participant, and we can't tell them when to keep the equipment on. Eastman encouraged everyone to get out there and ride the bikes in order to get feedback, so that Bike Nation and OCTA can fix whatever problems exist.

Eastman and the committee discussed recent problems with locking the bikes and how the best way to communicate feedback is to email OCTA and BikeNation, so that it is documented.

The Committee asked about the map of the location of the stations. Eastman communicated that he does not know when an updated map will be made available to the public. He discussed why the ribbon cutting event was postponed and why it was postponed to the end.

Member Rands asked if they are going to extend the testing and if there would be more stations tested. Eastman responded that no cut off date has yet been identified, that more stations are planned to be tested, and currently there are only three sites being tested (City Hall, SOCO parking garage and the bus station).

Eastman stated the other 7 locations have been installed and will start testing soon. Eastman clarified that the approved "Performing Arts Center" location was denied by the State Fire Marshal because it is in a fire lane, so it was relocated to a location near Nutwood and Commonwealth. The Committee continued to discuss certain locations they had reviewed, but were not located on Campus in the exact spots shown on the plans. As an example, Chairman Hiegel clarified that the Rec Center location was moved to the northeast, and is now in the Campus' "no ride" zone. The Committee discussed how the on-line BikeLink map shows stations in the wrong location.

In response to a BUSC question, Eastman clarified that beta testers are limited to city employees and committee members. Member Buck discussed his experience with using the bike and gave feedback. The BUSC discussed pros and cons. The Committee discussed the lights on the bike and how when you stop peddling the light goes off. Eastman stated his understanding that bikes will not be available for check out after 10pm. The Committee discussed the system and compared it to Anaheim, and inquired about the status of Bike Nation in Long Beach and Los Angeles. The Committee discussed how feedback is important to resolve issues before it is open to the public. Eastman discussed that Bike Nation is doing their best to respond to the current beta tester comments. He informs that Bike Nation will be hiring someone for customer relations.

2. BIKE FULLERTON Public Outreach Program

Chairman Hiegel clarified the agenda item and stated that members were supposed to do some homework and report back with their thoughts at this meeting.

Member Carroll informs that the CSUF PD is very interested in doing an outreach program with Fullerton schools. The Committee discussed the benefit of picking a school near CSUF which has more riders.

Vice-Chair Trimble discussed her concerns on how to get a Public Outreach program at local schools started, including funding. Senior Planner Eastman indicated that he is less concerned with obtaining funding for the public school program being discussed, as the funds are not significant and there is money available for school oriented programs. For

funding equipment, prizes and paperwork, he suggested contacting retailers so see if they want to be involved. However, he said the first thing to do is to put a work plan together that shows what the program is and how it will come together, as no one will commit their time and money when nothing is on paper. Eastman clarified that at the last meeting it was determined by the Committee that the most important thing to do at this point is to identify an outreach/safety program that would serve as the basis of the education material. Members were to review the NHTSA info on-line and report back at this meeting.

Chair Hiegel discussed the site NHTSA and their information "Kids and Bicycle Safety" in order to create a flyer from that. Member Rands clarified that the goal is to find literature that fits the needs in order to put one together. The committee discussed to have a flyer to go home with the student so that the parents go over it.

Eastman stated that first we need a commitment from the school and the participants before figuring out the funding for the flyers and grants, and that a work plan would be a start to defining and selling the program.

Vice Chair Trimble communicated that she can make contact with the school and/or schools that the Committee would want to be involved.

Eastman will provide the work plan format. Member Carol said he would speak with CSUF to see if they had an outline of their program and how they thought they could participate. Chair Hiegel said that at the next meeting the Committee will have to agree on the content of the program (flyers to send home, student home bike inspections, tests to be taken by students, handouts to parents on bike safety, etc.). Chair Hiegel said the internet links to the NHTSA website will be e-mailed to the Committee members.

Vice Chair Trimble left the meeting.

3. Sharrows Markings

Eastman reviewed the sharrow discussion that occurred at the last meeting regarding sharrows, and said the Committee had not identifying ALL the streets that would have sharrows, but had provided some suggestions for streets that are good initial candidates. Eastman stated that the initial streets for the sharrows can use their connectivity related to the Bike Link program as leverage for grant funding. He clarified that the idea was to develop a list of initial candidate streets so that the city could develop a policy as to where sharrows should be installed. He suggested the Committee discuss basic sharrow criteria so that Traffic Engineer Mark Miller can review a draft policy.

Chair Hiegel suggested that a main traffic street that has parking would be a good candidate for sharrows because bikes need to ride in the street because there is no shoulder.

Member Rands proposed to use what is currently allowed within the State that was presented by Mark Miller in a past meeting. She is curious to know why this would go to Council. Eastman stated that Council needs to adopt some criteria for where sharrows will go because the City doesn't currently have any sharrows.

Member Rands left the meeting.

Chair Hiegel suggested sharrows should be installed on fairly busy streets, particularly where a street curves and it is hard to see far ahead. Narrow streets were discussed, as well as Class II bicycle lanes and 13 feet wide or narrower lanes. It was agreed that a good criteria

for where to put sharrows is on Class III routes (i.e., sharrows generally should not be placed on streets that don't have a Class III designations).

Member Reinhardt suggested that placing sharrows in some alleys would be nice; such as connecting Highland up to Berkeley. The Committee discussed how that alley is unique as it is identified as a route in the Bicycle Master Plan.

The Committee discussed how fast moving streets are not good candidates for sharrows, although there may be some "exceptions" such as on Harbor Blvd. between Bastanchury and Valencia Mesa. Eastman will look into a possible speed limit criteria with a deviation based on a professional opinion of the City's Traffic Engineer.

The Committee discussed Chapman and Harbor sharrows and signage to inform motorists. Eastman stated that by placing a sharrow in the middle of the street, the people that use it will be the most comfortable ones and other people not comfortable we most likely use the sidewalk.

Member Buck suggested using sharrows where a Class II route unexpectedly ends (i.e., a lack of bike lane continuity on Class II routes). Member Carroll agreed and added that a good place for sharrows is before intersections where there is a lack of a right turn pocket.

The BUSC clarified that they are all in agreement that sharrows should be placed in the middle of the lane on those streets that are good candidates for sharrows (e.g., a 17 foot lane is a better candidate for a Class II route than a Class III). There was significant discussion regarding the width of roadways and the comfortable dimension for riding a bike near the curb, versus in the middle of the street. Mark Miller will compare whatever the BUSC's recommended policy is to the State criteria, and suggest alternatives based on potential City liabilities.

Member Carroll discussed how sharrows need to be visible to the motorist, so that they know the bike will be in their space. He has concerns of the sharrows paint being worn down due to motorist driving over the lane.

Member Carroll left the meeting.

4. East Wilshire Avenue Bicycle Boulevard Status (1:31 minutes)

Senior Planner Eastman reported that the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) committed to funding the design work for a Bike Boulevard on East Wilshire. He received an email from SCAG stating they will contact the City in the new year to refine a scope of work, with the intent of getting an RFP out in March or April 2014. Eastman clarified the first step would be to review the City's proposed scope of work and make amendments. Involving the BUSC in the selection of the consultant is a relevant consideration, such as including a BUSC member on the RFP selection panel.

Chair Hiegel asked about how diverters work, and he drew an example on the white board. The Committee discussed different ways of installing diverters. Some diverters are placed in intersection medians, creating "dead ends" for through traffic; whereas other diverters are diagonal through the intersection, such that the through streets become curved streets. The Committee discussed various ways of realigning traffic to avoid the neighborhood streets, which ultimately impacts the neighborhood streets, so neighborhood support of the design is needed. There was discussion of on-street parking by residents and students, tenants vs. owners, and various other traffic factors.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Hiegel asked if BUSC members can attend the regular December meeting, and whether the BUSC should even have the meeting. Member Buck will not be present for a meeting in December. Members present agreed to not have a meeting in December. Chair Hiegel asked Planner Eastman to poll the members and see if a meeting is warranted.

Chair Hiegel asked to place the following items on the next meetings agenda: OCTA BikeLink Pilot Project; the BIKE FULLERTON Public Outreach Program; Sharrows Markings; and a BUSC member update regarding the Engineers Workshop the attended.

Jay Eastman, Senior Planner

The meeting was adjourned at 6:49 pm.	