

## **Proposed City Council Changes to the Saint Paul Bicycle Plan –3/18/2015**

### **Map amendments to the Saint Paul Bicycle Plan**

- In reference to Transportation Committee Amendment #5: As the Transportation Committee of the Planning Commission recommended, amend Plan to reclassify University from Aldine Street to Transfer Road on Figure 3 from a “minor bikeway” to a “major bikeway” and on Figure 4 from “enhanced shared lane” to “in-street separated lane.”
- In reference to Transportation Committee Amendment #4: As the Planning Commission recommended, designate 7<sup>th</sup> St as a “Corridor for Additional Study” on Figures 3 and 4, with the exception that W. 7<sup>th</sup> should be designated as a “Corridor for Additional Study for Enhanced Shared Lanes.”
- On Figures 3 and 4 of the Bicycle Plan, designate Lafond Avenue between Grotto and Chatsworth as a Bicycle Boulevard.

### **Text amendments to the Saint Paul Bicycle Plan**

*\*Normal text is existing text in the SPBP; underlined text is the proposed additional language.\**

- In reference to Transportation Committee Amendment #4 regarding 7<sup>th</sup> St, add W. 7<sup>th</sup> between Kellogg and Mississippi River Boulevard to table 6.11.1, “Interim Facilities & Other Notes,” specifying that implementation of enhanced shared lanes will not displace parking or travel lanes.
- In reference to Transportation Committee Amendment #1, as the Transportation Committee Recommended, amend the plan to read:

#### **Chapter 6.10 (page 65)**

The planned downtown trail network can be described as a loop alignment as well as connections between the loop and the existing bikeways approaching downtown. The loop trail will effectively place a majority of downtown within two or three blocks of the trail. Connections between the loop and other existing and planned routes into and out of downtown will be developed prior to or in concurrence with the loop to ensure connectivity to the surrounding bicycle network.

- In reference to Transportation Committee Amendments #2 & 3, as the Planning Commission recommended, amend the plan to read:

#### **Chapter 9.0 Implementation (page 94) – add as opening paragraph:**

This document establishes a long-term vision that will take many years to fully implement. This plan does not establish a formal timeline for implementation. As such, regular and routine progress reports should be completed to provide a transparent accounting of progress in achieving the vision of this plan. Saint Paul Bicycle Plan progress shall be reviewed annually by the Transportation Committee. In addition, City staff will compile a ranked list and plan for completing the Action Items listed in the Saint Paul Bicycle Plan for Transportation Committee review.

- Amendment related to public process and the implementing the Saint Paul Bicycle Plan:

#### **Chapter 9.2 (page 96)**

In some cases, bikeways may be implemented quickly and easily without changing the operational characteristics of a roadway. This is particularly true of roadways identified for enhanced shared lane type bikeways that rely on shared lane markings or signage alone to establish the bikeway. In these cases, a formal planning or public involvement process may not be necessary and the bikeway may be implemented immediately upon identification of funding.

In other cases, where impacts to the corridor may be more significant (e.g. parking restrictions or lane removals), a public involvement process will be necessary to discuss design alternatives, engage nearby residents, and confirm the recommendations in this plan before implementation.

The Bikeway Development Process proposed in this plan should be scaled as appropriate to each project. Where an implementation opportunity has not been identified, this planning process may be completed over the course of a year or more. In other cases, such as when an implementation opportunity such as a scheduled mill & overlay is approaching, this process may need to be condensed so that an informed decision can be made in a timely manner. In both cases, the intent of this process is to provide a robust public engagement process.

- Amendment related to Safe Routes to School:

**Chapter 1.4 (page 6) amend the third paragraph as follows:**

As a corridor-level planning document, this plan can not anticipate the many small-scale connections throughout the city that potentially provide great value to the community. For example, the construction of a short trail spur connecting a neighborhood to an adjacent trail, or creation of spurs from the proposed network to reach schools in order to achieve a Safe Routes to School network, may not be identified in this plan, though it is clearly in the spirit of promoting bicycle travel throughout the city. Such proposals should be judged to be consistent with the intent of this plan.

- Amendment related to enhanced shared lane treatments:

**Chapter 5.3 (page 45)**

An enhanced shared lane uses pavement markings or signage to reinforce the rights and responsibilities of roadway users. These are corridors where bicyclists and motorists share the roadway and bicyclists are subject to all of the same applicable laws and expectations as motorists. These corridors are identified using some form of signage or pavement markings intended to provide greater visibility for cyclists, or as wayfinding guides for cyclists to find preferred routes. Enhanced shared lanes are best suited to roadways with lower operational speeds and traffic volumes.

Specific treatments for these corridors will depend on context, however, common treatments may include:

- Shared Lane Markings (“Sharrows”)
- W11-1 or W15-1P Bicycle Warning or SHARE THE ROAD Signage
- R4-11 BIKES MAY USE FULL LANE Signage
- D1 series wayfinding signage
- D11-1 series BIKE ROUTE signage
- M1 series identification signage

The type of treatments selected should be consistent with the level of guidance warranted by specific local conditions. In select cases where there is a desire to provide additional guidance or conspicuity, the use of innovative or experimental treatments should be considered, subject to FHWA guidance, including the use of colored pavements or other features.