

NOTICE OF MEETING

VANCOUVER BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A G E N D A

DATE: Wednesday, July 19, 2006

TIME: 5:30 p.m.

PLACE: Strathcona Room
Sub-Ground, City Hall

*If you are unable to attend the meeting,
please advise Tina Hildebrandt at 604.873.7268 or
e-mail tina.hildebrandt@vancouver.ca*

*Agendas and Minutes are available on the internet at
<http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/civicagencies/bicycle/index.htm>*

Attendance

Leave of Absence requested by Mary Sherlock, Kay Teschke and Ken Timewell.

Adoption of Minutes

The minutes of the June 21, 2006 meeting are to be adopted.

Correspondence

The Correspondence folder will be circulated.

1. University Endowment Lands (5:35 p.m. - 6:30 p.m.)

At its meeting on May 3, 2006, the Bicycle Network Sub-committee identified a series of issues (*attached*) to be passed on to the Ministry of Transportation regarding the University Endowment Lands. Representatives were unable to attend the June 21, 2006, meeting, and were reinvited to the July 19, 2006, meeting.

Accordingly, David Grigg, UBC, and Grant Smith, Ministry of Transportation have been invited in order to respond to these issues.

2. East Fraserlands ODP - Proposed Bike Plans (6:30 p.m. - 7:15 p.m.)

Wali Memon, Strategic Transportation Planning, Peter Stary, Neighbourhood Transportation and Greenways, Matt Shillito, Current Planning and Andrea Tang, Current Planning will present an overview of the East Fraserlands ODP particularly the accommodation of cycling in the neighbourhood, changes to the Kent Avenue Bikeway and the development of the Fraser River Trail Greenway.

3. Transportation Plan Progress Report (7:15 p.m. - 7:35 p.m.)

Sustainability staff will be present to discuss potential marketing strategies for the 2007 transportation plan.

4. Southeast False Creek Update (7:35 p.m. - 7:55 p.m.)

Michael Naylor, Planning, and a representative from the Engineering department will provide an update on Southeast False Creek.

5. Sub-committee Reports (7:55 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.)

- a. Bicycle Network Sub-committee*
- b. Bicycle Education and Promotion Sub-committee*

6. New Business

Next Meeting:

Wednesday, September 20, 2006
5:30 p.m.
Strathcona Room
Sub-Ground, City Hall

* * * * *

BICYCLE NETWORK SUB-COMMITTEE

Meeting Notes – May 3, 2006

Present: Jack Becker
Colin Brander
Allison Felker
Gertjan Hofman
David Pritchard (Chair)
Peter Stary (Engineering)

Gateway program

A significant number of questions and requests were identified to pass on to Gateway staff so that they can be addressed at the May 17th Bicycle Advisory Committee. These are contained in an attachment to these notes entitled “Questions and Comments re Gateway Program”.

University Endowment Lands issues

The following issues were identified in order to pass them on to Ministry of Transportation and UBC staff, who will be asked to respond to them at a BAC meeting. The items appear in the order of relative priority as determined by the Sub-Committee.

1. Imperial Drive between 16th Avenue and 29th Avenue. Sight distances, lack of street lighting and speed of traffic are concerns. Improvements for cyclists and pedestrians are needed – either paved shoulders or consideration of closing the road to cars and leaving it open for non-motorized users.
2. Chancellor Blvd. Bike lanes, or another similar facility, are needed to connect existing bike lanes on W 4th Avenue east of Drummond and on Chancellor west of Acadia.
3. NW Marine Drive, City of Vancouver boundary to Chancellor. Presently westbound (uphill) cyclists are directed to use a very narrow asphalt walkway west of the Acadia Beach parking lot. On the rest of this road cyclists share relatively narrow lanes with motorists. The roadway surface is in poor condition in some areas. Improved bicycle facilities are needed, especially in the uphill section.
4. 16th /SW Marine Drive intersection. Wide, large radius right turn channels are a concern for through cyclists on northbound Marine, especially the dual lane northbound to eastbound channel.
5. SW Marine Drive, Camosun to UBC. Although there are wide shoulders in good condition here, speed of traffic is a concern. Is it possible to provide separation between motor vehicle lanes and the shoulder?
6. NW Marine west of West Mall. Parked vehicles on the south/east side narrow the available space and opening doors can be a hazard to cyclists. Can parking be removed here?

The issue of improved signing to inform cyclists of access to and from Lion’s Gate Bridge was also raised, as this is believed to be a Ministry of Transportation jurisdiction.

Canada Line station areas

This item was referred to the Sub-Committee at the March BAC meeting. Unfortunately the appropriate staff person with the City's Rapid Transit Office was unable to attend. The Sub-Committee identified the following issues to address with the City's Rapid Transit Office:

- Bicycle lanes on Cambie Street;
- Bicycle distribution network between Canada Line stations and their catchment areas;
- Bicycle access in the immediate vicinity of stations (paths, ramps, signals, etc.);
- Bicycle parking at stations.

Peter informed the Sub-Committee that bicycle accommodation within the stations was the responsibility of the Canada Line project office. The following issues related to station and transit car access were identified to address with Translink and/or Canada Line staff:

- The locations, speeds and capacity of elevators;
- Bicycles on escalators – step type versus moving ramp type;
- Bicycle wheel troughs on stairways;
- Accommodating bicycles within cars – capacity and retention systems.

Bike stencils for signal detector loops

The Sub-Committee identified 10 priority locations for bike stencils at semi-actuated signals. These are signals at which the minor street approaches are detected with loops in the pavement. Further input from BAC members on priority locations is welcomed.

The identified priority locations are:

1. 4th Diversion/4th/NW Marine
2. Abbott at Pacific
3. Helmcken at Burrard
4. Carrall at Pacific
5. Bridgeway at "Collectors" (ramps to and from Hwy 1)
6. SW Marine/Cornish at 70th
7. Nelson at Expo
8. Homer at Pacific
9. Hornby at Pacific
10. Knight St. Bridge offramp at SE Marine

It was also suggested that the location of the bicycle button on Granville at Milton/SW Marine be reviewed and that bicycle activation be considered for the bus actuated signal on SW Marine at the westbound Laing Bridge off-ramp.

The Sub-Committee recommends to the Bicycle Advisory Committee THAT:

- A pilot program to mark bicycle stencils on detector loops at 10 to 20 semi-actuated signals be undertaken this year to determine costs and equipment needs and that the program be expanded next year to complete the marking of all remaining semi-actuated signals.

Next meeting

Will be scheduled as required.

Please inform the writer of any errors or omissions.

Peter Stary
Neighbourhood Transportation Branch
604-871-6437
peter.stary@vancouver.ca
f:\mem\bns060503.doc

attach.

Questions and Comments re Gateway Program
for May 17, 2006 Bicycle Advisory Committee Meeting

1. Vancouver City Council approved the Bicycle Advisory Committee's recommended target of a 10% cycling mode split by 2010. How will the Gateway project support this goal? Are the proposed designs adequate to support this level of use?
2. What is the mode share target for cycling that Gateway foresees as a result of Gateway improvements and additions to cycling facilities?
3. What design standards will be used for developing cycling facilities? Will the designs be at a suitable level to attract people to cycle or combine cycling and transit instead of driving, and be safe and attractive for a wide range of users including children and less confident cyclists?
4. How many additional vehicle trips are projected, and where? What will the impacts be on City streets - arterials, collectors and residential?
5. What will the air quality effects of the Gateway project be, including any additional vehicle trips? What will the air quality impacts be on cyclists along the corridor?
6. Will the Gateway Program make available funding for traffic calming to discourage rat-running through nearby residential neighbourhoods and ensure that existing cycling facilities are not degraded?
7. Will there be funding available for motorist education to deal with any added motorist/cyclist conflicts caused by increased motor vehicle traffic on the already congested Vancouver street network?

Funding Commitment

8. Is Gateway committed to delivering the improvements in the Cycling Plan Overview dated Sept., 2005, or as may be enhanced through consultation with the cycling community, no matter the cost, or will Gateway only deliver cycling infrastructure enhancements in the plan to a \$50 million maximum?
9. Will the \$50 million funding for cycling be directed only to the incremental cost of providing cycling infrastructure or are other project elements included?
10. How much of the \$50 million will be targeted for sidewalk improvements?
11. Will Gateway commit to a 5 year timeframe for delivery of the cycling infrastructure within a finalized Cycling Plan after consultation with the cycling community?

12. As some of the infrastructure improvements currently within the Cycling Plan, or as may be added through consultation with the cycling community, are not contingent on the start of the Gateway Program corridors plan, will Gateway agree to start the implementation of the Cycling Plan this year?

Cost-Sharing Funding

13. Is the intent of the \$10 million cost-sharing program to be an expansion of the municipalities' current cycling investment programs (i.e. new projects not within the current municipal plans for next 5 years), or is the intent of the \$10 million cost-sharing program to help fund already planned implementation of the municipalities' approved cycling programs?

14. Municipalities have approved capital plans in place. How does Gateway see the municipalities adding additional capital into their plans to match the provincial cost-sharing portion?

15. Will Gateway require an equal cost-sharing arrangement or will Gateway allow a flexible sharing arrangement between partners? Flexible sharing arrangements could result in provincial contributions ranging up to 100% for any specific project.

16. Will Gateway allow for three or more cost-sharing partners?

17. Will the funds raised by a municipality be considered that municipality's contribution regardless if the funding comes from taxes, development fees, in-kind contributions, private sectors contributions or participation with other locally based organizations such as Translink?

18. Will Gateway work with TransLink in administering cost-sharing funding, thereby reducing the bureaucracy and improving the flexibility and coordination of municipal applications – i.e. one-stop application for funds?

19. Will Gateway allow funding for multi-year projects under the \$10 million cost-sharing program?

Gateway Highway #1 project, proposed cycling facilities for Vancouver section

Around 1992 the Cassiar Connector was built and subsequently the 2nd Narrows Bridge underwent minor upgrading. At that time sidewalks weren't widened nor other major works such as a connection between sidewalks done because it was anticipated that the bridge would undergo major reconstruction in 20 years. This reconstruction appears not to be scheduled in the near future so it is appropriate to consider upgrades to the cycling and pedestrian facilities on the 2nd Narrows Bridge as part of the Gateway Highway #1 project.

The following improvements are proposed:

- Widened sidewalks on 2nd Narrows Bridge;
- Connection between east and west sidewalks at or near the south end of the 2nd Narrows Bridge;
- Improved connections for cyclists at McGill (direct access to and from 2nd Narrows Bridge);
- Improved connections for cyclists at Hastings/Collectors (ramps to and from Hwy 1) (direct cycling specific routing rather than current pedestrian crossings);
- Improvements to Williams Street pedestrian overpass to accommodate cycling;
- Cycling/pedestrian connection along Hwy 1 corridor between Central Valley Greenway and 2nd Narrows Bridge;
- Resolution of difficult traffic conditions for cyclists at Boundary Road on and off ramps (see note below).

Note re ramps: Currently freeway style off ramps, such as the Boundary Road Exit 28A , cause problems for cyclists, as motor vehicles often exit at high rates of speed and cyclists must often merge right to cross back to the curb lane. Exit 28A is particularly bad, as cyclists are on an uphill grade and sight distance is very limited. Similar difficulties exist at on ramps, where cyclists must merge left across the on ramps. Are there plans to upgrade these types of ramps to regular intersection configurations at locations where they intersect regular city streets and if not, what plans are there to reduce conflicts between motor vehicles and cyclists at these locations?