CITY OF COLLEGE STATION
Home of Texas A&M University

MINUTES

BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN, AND GREENWAYS ADVISORY BOARD
Monday, October 5th 3:00 PM
College Station City Hall
Council Chambers
1101 Texas Avenue
College Station, Texas, 77840

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Blanche Brick, Phillip Lasley, James Batenhorst, Jon Denton

MEMBERS ABSENT: Robert Lightfoot, Scott Shafer, Brandon Boatcallie

STAFF PRESENT: Greenways Program Manager Venessa Garza, Mayor Nancy Berry, Director of Planning and Development Lance Simms, Assistant Director of Planning and Development Molly Hitchcock, Director of Public Works Donald Harmon, Assistant Director of Public Works Emily Fisher, City Engineer Alan Gibbs, Assistant City Engineer Carol Cotter, and Board Secretary Kristen Hejny and Staff Assistant Amber Johnson.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 1: Call to Order.

Chairman Brick called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 2: Hear Visitors

There were no visitors present to address the Board.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3: Consideration, possible action, and discussion to approve meeting Absences:

- James Batenhorst ~ September 3, 2015
- Scott Shafer ~ October 5, 2015
- Robert Lightfoot ~ October 5, 2015
- Brandon Boatcallie ~ October 5, 2015

Board Member Denton motioned to approve the absence requests from September 3, 2015 and October 5, 2015. The motion was seconded by Board Member Lasley and was approved (4-0).

AGENDA ITEM NO. 4: Consideration, discussion, and possible action to approve meeting Minutes.

Board Member Lasley motioned to approve the meeting Minutes, from September 8, 2015. The motion was seconded by Board Member Denton and was approved (4-0).

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5: Presentation, possible action and discussion regarding a recommendation on a cost mitigation option related to a change order for the Lick Creek Hike and Bike Trail Project.

Director of Public Works Donald Harmon was available to present this item to the Board. Additional design elements were added to the Lick Creek Trail for safety purposes which caused an increase in the total cost of construction. The Board was asked to provide a recommendation from three options:

Option 1 – No cost mitigation. Add $170,000 to the total construction cost.

Option 2 – Cost mitigation with a road diet by encroaching into the roadway by 2 feet to widen the sidewalk and replacing the curb and gutter along with the addition of bike lanes along Pebble Creek Parkway. Deduct $30,000 from the total construction cost.

Option 3 – Cost Mitigation by keeping the existing sidewalk and making spot repairs to meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements along with the addition of bike lanes along Pebble Creek Parkway. Deduct $140,000 from the total construction cost.

Board Member Lasley asked if there is a schematic or a rendering of the existing option of a meandering trail.

Director Harmon stated that he does not have the detailed drawing but that it roughly goes in and out of the berms and avoids the poles and comes back to the sidewalk sections in between the jaunts out into the berm area.

Mr. Lasley asked if it already connects with the sidewalk.

Mr. Harmon stated that it does connect with the sidewalk and is not completely off set from the roadway.

Mr. Lasley asked if parts of the sidewalk will be removed.

Mr. Harmon stated that parts of the sidewalk not associated with the trail would be removed.

Mr. Lasley asked if street furniture or shading structures can be done with this segment if one the different options presented are chosen.

Mr. Harmon asked Greenways Program Manager Venessa Garza if she is aware of any plantings in the area.

Ms. Garza stated that there were in the beginning but that those had been removed.

Mr. Harmon stated that he believes that there is some room to add some plantings and benches along the area with easements in the back. There are some opportunities on the other side of William D. Fitch Pkwy close to Lick Creek Park that could provide nicer facilities and better areas in which to plant. The water line that runs in the area makes it difficult to put any footings, clear the area, or place anything on top of it.

Mr. Lasley asked what could be done on the other side of the water line.

Mr. Harmon stated that is where they are going with the meandering trail but that they are currently unclear where all of the laterals run as there are not clear record drawings that document where they are.

Board Member Denton stated that to him Option 3 made the most sense because you do not have to worry about the water lines or the sprinkler system and you do gain the bike lanes on both sides.

Mr. Harmon stated that having the bike lanes that are the same width on each side of the roadway would provide a symmetric look.

Chairman Blanche Brick stated that she believed that option was the Transportation Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Harmon stated that he is unsure if there was a general consensus but that Option 2 with addition of some sidewalk was being discussed with that committee.

The board had an open discussion about the different options available.

Mr. Denton asked what the primary use for the sidewalk is.

Mr. Harmon stated that as of now the primary use is recreational but that in the future it will be mainly be used as a connection to the park.

Ms. Brick asked about the cost deduction regarding Option 2.

Mr. Harmon stated the cost differences between the three options presented to the committee.

Board Member Batenhorst asked if they had looked at redoing the entire sidewalk in place.

Mr. Harmon stated that they had looked at doing that but the cost was greater.

Mr. Batenhorst stated that he had concerns with the 2 foot sidewalk and tying it into the existing sidewalk.

Mr. Harmon stated that has been addressed and that there is a plan in place to ensure the sidewalk will meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.

The board held a discussion regarding the technical construction requirements of the sidewalk.

Mr. Batenhorst asked what the functional class of the road is in regard to Option 3.

Transportation Planning Coordinator Danielle Singh stated that the roadway is classed as a two-lane major roadway.

Mr. Batenhorst asked if an 8 foot sidewalk would be required if someone is building the next section.

Ms. Singh stated that an 8 foot sidewalk would be required and she believes that the section that is being constructed by the developer includes a multi-use path intended to connect with the other multi-use path being designed.

Mr. Harmon stated that they are conscious of creating a higher standard but that in some cases in established neighborhoods they are sometimes constrained by existing conditions.

Mr. Lasley stated that he is okay with keeping it as is and adding the bike lanes but that his main concern is the difference between it being a trail and a sidewalk. He would like to see some improvement in landscaping or other options to make it unique as the purpose is to create a trail.

Mr. Harmon stated he believes there is an opportunity for them to look at some hardscape or maybe an additional shade structure. Possibly create a bulb out or a stop point. He advised that adding a bench and some landscaping would not be too difficult but that a shade structure he would like to review a little more but may be an option.

Chairman Brick asked if they did choose this option if they could add that into their recommendation that a shade structure and plantings would be looked into.

Mr. Lasley asked how this will tie in and transition with the new trail on the other side.

Mr. Harmon stated that the multi-use path would connect into Lick Creek Park.

Ms. Brick motioned to recommend approval of Option 3 to include some screening and shading being considered.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Batenhorst and was approved (4-0).

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6: Public hearing, presentation, possible action, and discussion regarding a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission on proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan Chapter 6 – Thoroughfare Plan and the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Greenways Master Plan.

Transportation Planning Coordinator Danielle Singh was available to present this item to the Board. Updates to Chapter 6 – Transportation include road amendments to the thoroughfare plan and context zones as well as corresponding bicycle and pedestrian components; complete streets and context sensitive solutions process, updated context-sensitive cross-sections and updates to the transportation maps.

Chairman Blanche Brick asked how the designation line for major arterial and major collector is determined.

Ms. Singh stated that the volume maps are looked at and ones that are determined to have a level of service that is deemed unacceptable or borderline and need extra capacity are bumped up to major arterial. If it does not need the extra capacity they are able to categorize it as a major collector.

Board Member James Batenhorst asked why the thoroughfares on Area 3 were removed.

Ms. Singh stated that they were not needed for capacity and it was not going to be proportional to the development there.

Ms. Brick asked what was going to be built for Speedway project.

Ms. Singh stated that they are not sure what is currently in development for that project.

Planning and Development Services Director Lance Simms stated that the discussion is still in progress and that plans had not yet been submitted.

Ms. Brick asked if this plan details anything in regards to Penberthy Road and George Bush Drive.

Ms. Singh stated that this is more of a high level plan that will not address specific mitigation, projects, or intersections specifically. There are other studies that the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) does that sometimes will supplement our thoroughfare plan. They have a FM 2818 corridor study to be conducted in 2016 and then a University Drive study to be completed in 2017 that will begin to address intersections specifically.

Ms. Singh discussed the possible widening of intersections and the additional right-of-way guidelines being proposed at intersections based on the classifications of the intersection. The goal being the ability to add right turn lanes at intersections. This would need to implemented not only in our Comprehensive Plan but it would also need to be added to the BCS United Guidelines before it would be a requirement for developers.

Board Member Phil Lasley asked in regards to the right-of-way guidelines for intersections was there consideration taken for bike lanes.

Ms. Singh stated that they had not gotten very specific in regards to bike lanes but that would be something that would be coordinated with the Greenways Program Manager Venessa Garza.

Mr. Lasley asked if right turn lanes would be required at all new intersections.

Ms. Singh stated that they it would be required at thoroughfares where they would like the extra capacity but not local streets except for engineering judgement.

Mr. Batenhorst motioned to recommend approval of the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan Chapter 6 – Thoroughfare Plan and the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Greenways Master Plan.

The motion was seconded by Board Member Jon Denton and was approved (4-0).

AGENDA ITEM NO. 7: Presentation and discussion regarding education and encouragement opportunities.

Greenways Program Manager Venessa Garza presented updates on this item. The board will need decide upon a few topics to create information videos regarding bike safety in preparation for National Bike Month in May in collaboration with the Public Communications department.

Board Member Phil Lasley suggested topics such as how to navigate intersections as both a cyclist and a motor vehicle operator including understanding bike detection. Also, common misconceptions regarding cycling.

Ms. Garza suggested this to be further discussed when more board members are able to be present and within the sub-committee meetings.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 8: Presentation and discussion regarding BPG Subcommittee Updates.

Greenways Manager Venessa Garza presented updates on this item. The Performance Measures group met and talked more in depth of the specific data that is available for performance measures and what that should include.

Board Member Phil Lasley stated that the subcommittee discussed what should be measured and what the measures will be used for.

Ms. Garza stated that more meetings would be scheduled with the subcommittee so that at the next meeting they can provide a list of the performance measures.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 9: Presentation and discussion regarding the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Greenways Advisory Board calendar of upcoming meetings.

- October 15, 2015 ~ Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting ~ City Hall, Council Chambers ~ 6:00 p.m.
- November 2, 2015 ~ Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Greenways Advisory Board ~ City Hall, Council Chambers ~ 3:00 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 10: Possible action and discussion on future agenda items – A Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Greenways Advisory Board Member may inquire about a subject for which notice has not been given. A statement of specific factual information or the recitation of existing policy may be given. Any deliberation shall be limited to a proposal to place the subject on an agenda for a subsequent meeting.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 8: Adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 4:08 p.m.

APPROVED:

Blanche Brick

Blanche Brick, Chairman

ATTEST:

Amber Johnson

Amber Johnson, Board Secretary