



West Lafayette Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee

Minutes of Meeting held Thursday March 10, 2016 6:00 PM
Board Room, West Lafayette Public Library

Present: Curt Ashendel (presiding), Jim Bethel, Stewart Frescas, and Carl Griffin.

1. The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm.

2. **Corrections were requested for the minutes** of the previous meeting (November 12, 2015) which were posted to the WLBPC web site (<http://www.westlafayettebikeped.org/Committee/Minutes.html>) on January 14, 2016 and also provided at this meeting. No corrections were noted in the meeting.

3. News of developments since the last meeting

- a. Two items of interest for bicyclists and pedestrians were discussed at the last meeting of the [APC Transportation Planning](#) Citizens Participation Committee (held January 26, 2016). One was the summary of the contract letting schedule for INDOT run projects in the area. Noteworthy is that the Teal Rd (US52) reconstruction project has been pushed back in time to allow more planning time and that funding constraints have forced the Lafayette trails project (including 3 separate trails) to be done piecemeal with local funds only. Also note was that the Wabash river-Sagamore Pkwy bridge replacement project will begin very soon resulting in significant rerouting of traffic. This rerouting will be combined with the current Happy Hollow construction and the soon to start work on the sewer interceptor-River Rd project that will close the State Street intersection at River Rd.

More impactful however was that there was a discussion of the Goals for the revision of the Metropolitan Transportation plan for 2040 (a long range plan). The last approved metropolitan transportation plan was for the year 2040 and next will be for 2045. Curt reported that this discussion was rather superficial and barely scratched the surface of what is needed, so he is planning to send a detailed email to John Thomas at the APC with some proposed goals. Included in this are those in last month's meeting minutes, but with some fleshing out, as well as some new ones. In part these came from the City of Buffalo Bicycle master plan (see next item, below). Curt presented a list of ideas and got feedback from those present at the meeting. The new list of ideas for goals is as follows (edited for clarity since they were presented at the meeting):

- Improved coordination of cyclist- and pedestrian- policies and projects across the APC, Tippecanoe County, West Lafayette, Purdue University, and Lafayette. This should include establishing bike-ped coordinator duties as part or all of an identified staff person within each jurisdiction/government entity as well as establishing steering committees/working groups/task forces involving bike-ped advocates and staff bike-ped coordinators for taking the lead with, monitoring, and final review of bike-ped only projects, plans, and policies.
- Strengthening, harmonizing, and expanding the Complete Streets policies of the APC, Municipalities, and Tippecanoe County such that as many future projects as possible – irrespective of funding source – are done under a consistently strong goal for completing the streets for all users. Exceptions should be removed, and locally funded projects should be included. The set aside for bike-ped components should be expanded to include all funding sources and the fraction of funds set aside should be increased.

- Funding of bike-ped projects, both included within new and reconstruction projects and also for bike-ped only projects (new and retrofits) should be monitored on an annual basis, not only in total dollars but also as a fraction of total non-transit transportation dollars. This will allow for documenting of improvements in spending on bike-ped projects. A mechanism should be found for prioritizing some of the total expenditures in order to fund bike-ped dedicated facility retrofit projects. This is needed to complete the existing networks of cycling and pedestrian facilities, because presently used alternative of relying completely on set-asides from new road or total road reconstruction projects will not complete the network for several decades.
- Envision a complete cycling network as well as a complete pedestrian network. The cycling network needs to be viewed as the combination of a set of networks at each of several levels of service including novice/family; occasional rider; and expert. Each of these different users see the cycling network through different lenses and have different needs, but all these users must be considered equally. Envisioning these networks within the MTP is proactive and seeds progress as that planned network evolves. This is what the MTP has been doing for vehicular traffic and it is high time for it to do so for ALL users of the transportation system. Doing this also facilitates reactive/rehabilitative solutions by identification of the network segments that are missing or inadequate for the level of service needed, so that these can be prioritized in order to complete the networks.
- Getting Bicycle Friendly City designation for both Cities, and making sustained effort towards increasing the status level of that recognition.
- Revising the Bicycle Pedestrian plan by replacing it with a Bicycle Plan and a separate Pedestrian Plan. There should be a goal to revise and update each plan no less often than every 5 years.
- Recognizing the need and supporting sustained funding for a sustained education effort to enhance awareness of pedestrians and cyclists and the safe use of our streets by all users. This should include generation and sustained maintenance of cycling and trail maps for the metropolitan area.
- Guidance on the expected level of service to be provided to pedestrians and cyclists, as well as optimizing locations where the system usage conflicts should be given in the plan. The level of detail for such guidance should be greater in the Bike and/or Pedestrian Plans than the MTP, but the MTP should have some language addressing technical guidance.
- Language about catalyst projects should be included in the MTP, and preferably this should be extended to include a listing and description of ideal candidates for such catalyst projects. The general language should indicate that these are immediate goals (for the next 2 to 5 years) and that they are to catalyze a change from the past way of doing things (reactive to problems and inadequacies) to the new way of doing things (progressively planning on anticipated needs). Some projects that should be listed include: the Education project (it needs a catchy name); Protected cycle paths (i.e., State Street Project); High-density urban bicycle parking solutions (Lafayette Main Street streetscape as the example); Intercity trails and bicycle highways (the Farm Heritage trail as the example); bicycle-friendly bridges across the Wabash River (the addition of the ramps to the John T Myers Bridge as the lead example). Each of these should have a “lead example” as well as follow-up plans for further adoption and implementation. Other items on this list of MTP goals could be included under Catalyst projects, including Bike-Ped steering committees, the Map project, and innovative markings.
- Being a leader in progress and innovation by using/adopting NEW markings, control devices, policies, and approaches towards optimizing safe and efficient use of the transportation system by all users. This should include experimentation of completely innovative or still experimental solutions when they are the best choice for a local problem. One example would

be use of the super-sharrow pavement marking on the Harrison bridge rightmost travel lanes. Another is the development of innovative solutions to the problem of snow removal that works for all users, not just vehicles. Another idea for this is developing an approach to using bike-boxes on the most heavily conflicted (bike vs vehicle) network segments.

- Counts of cyclist and pedestrian users of the transportation system are virtually non-existent and this is highly imbalanced relative to the collection and modeling of the vehicle counts in the MTP. Financial and labor resources need to be added for increasing the counting of cyclists and of pedestrians so that adequate network analysis can be done for ALL users of the transportation system.
- b. Related to the updating of the MTP, as well as the long overdue updating of the Bike-Ped plan, is the recently developed [Buffalo NY Bicycle master plan](#). This excellent example of a plan shows many things that can be emulated both in our updated Bike-Ped plan and in the goals section of the MTP. In particular, Curt liked the “Envisioning the network” with its view of several overlapping networks of routes offering different levels of service to cyclists with different levels of expertise. Also, the catalyst projects are a great way to plan for creating change by catalyzing a new way of doing things. While these are great ideas for the Bike-Ped Plan revision, which still is a work in progress, they also are great ideas for the MTP (see the preceding item, immediately above.) Thanks to Jan Myers for sending the tip about this listing in the [Transportation Research Board eNewsletter](#). The TRB is a division of the National Research Council, which is run by the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine.
 - c. There were two meetings related to the State Street project in the past two months, including a public presentation at Happy Hollow School on the evening of February 4, and a public hearing at the WL Redevelopment Commission on February 11. There were some meetings held in advance of this to go over the partial plans that were available on the web. The plans suggested that there were potential issues with the cycle path including its markings, its protection from vehicle traffic, and its interference by pedestrians in some locations and with vehicles entering alleys or private properties at other locations. At the meeting it was learned that the path will be required to be built according to NACTO and AASHTO standards, which helps. These concerns were collected and put into a single set of comments that were presented at the public hearing held by the Redevelopment Commission. This project will require continued monitoring and advocacy as it is only partially designed at this point in time.
 - d. The continuing meetings about improving the safety of cyclists on the Harrison bridge and throughout the cities (referred to by the name County-Cities-Cycling meetings) involved meetings on January 19th.and February 19th. Curt was unable to attend either meeting, but they were discussed based on the minutes provided by Rose Kazcmarowski. The January meeting included a presentation by Hilltop-to-Hilltop about its strong interests in advocating for increasing cycling and walking in the urban area as a means to increase business patronage without further pressure on vehicle parking. In both meetings two other topics were discussed. The first was the \$30K funding for the education/outreach effort. This mostly was a lot of administrative details and in the end a subgroup was formed with the task of taking care of the administration of this. The second was the mapping project begun by Joe Kasper of Bicycle Lafayette, but also attracting considerable interest from the APC (which has considerable GIS staff expertise and access to hardware and software needed) and potentially Hilltop-to-Hilltop for funding the printing. Jim Bethel expressed an interest in helping with this.
 - e. Since the last meeting Jim Bethel emailed news stories on Dutch Junction (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/dutch-junction_us_56a0260be4b0d8cc1098b7b3) and Bike Highways in Germany (<http://www.resilience.org/stories/2016-02-18/moving-beyond-the-autobahn-germany-s-new-bike-highways>). Curt liked the Dutch junction (where bike routes, when intersecting a road, have a marked crossing that is adjacent to but separate from the pedestrian crossing. The bike

crossing is marked distinctly from the ped crossing area. He also commented that this is likely to become highly applicable in our community, most notably in the State Street project. Jim mentioned that the Farm Heritage trail may be a good place to have our first bike highway, or at least a wide enough multiuse trail that would allow for higher speeds. Curt commented that as bikes and peds increase in number it will only be a matter of time before dedicated (bike-only and adjacent ped-only) facilities are implemented in the most heavily used areas, and that we should be making sure that our long range planning takes this into consideration.

- f. Curt announced that Timothy Stroshine (tstroshine@tippecanoe.in.gov) of the APC will be doing pedestrian counts on State Street in WL on March 22-24 and is seeking volunteers to help with this project to establish a baseline prior to the initiation of construction of the planned improvements. 3 one hour counts will be done 8-9 am, noon-1pm, and 3-4 pm. Please contact Tim directly if you are interested in volunteering. His office phone is 765-423-9242.

4. Open forum for problems and ideas for new actions

None were reported.

5. Projects of the Committee discussed

None were discussed.

6. Other business and announcements

- The next meeting of the APC CPC is scheduled to be on Tuesday March 22 at 7:00 pm in the Grand Prairie Room of the Tippecanoe Office Building.
- The next meeting of this committee is scheduled for Thursday May 12, 2016 at 6:00 pm.

7. The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:10 pm

These minutes were submitted to the WLBPC website on March 11, 2016 by Curt Ashendel