

MINUTES
BIKE, PEDESTRIAN, AND TRAILS COMMISSION
February 13, 2023

CALL TO ORDER

Matt Gworek called the virtual meeting of the Bike, Pedestrian and Trails Commission to order at 6:01 pm on February 13, 2023.

ROLL CALL

The following members were present for roll call:

BPTC Members: Matt Gworek, Chairperson
 David Clair, Member
 Alex Rawal, Member
 Rick Blauvelt, Member

Town Staff Present: Kevin Schorzman, Staff Liaison
 Chris Hassig, Board of Trustees Liaison
 Kae McDonald, Boards and Commissions Clerk

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion Passed: Matt ***moved*** to approve the Bike, Pedestrian, and Trail Commission meeting minutes from January 9, 2023. Alex ***seconded*** the motion, and it was ***unanimously approved***.

PERSONS PRESENT NOT ON THE AGENDA

There was no one present, not on the agenda, to address the Commission.

Matt noted that Niki Delson, representing the Carbondale Age-Friendly Community Initiative, would not be attending the meeting and as a result Agenda items #5 and #6 would be postponed for discussion at the March meeting. He added that national representatives from AARP are planning to visit Carbondale in April to produce a promotional video on CAFCI's walk audit work. He commended Niki and CAFCI for their role in this project.

DRAFT MULTI-MODAL MOBILITY AND ACCESS PLAN REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Matt opened the discussion by noting that Kevin's suggestion at the last meeting to work on the draft Request for Proposal with a smaller group produced the document included in this meeting's packet. Matt commented that through this process they are moving away from specific items and moving toward a statement of objectives for the RFP.

Kevin pointed out that a key item to keep in mind regarding the development of the RFP is to clearly explain the project objectives without inserting predicted outcomes. He added that the point is to hire a consultant who has more

knowledge than the group and can provide recommendations and guidance and then through the development of the plan, lead discussions regarding the specific items that should be included in the plan.

Matt noted that in the process of crafting the RFP they moved away from the bullet points developed at last month's meeting to a more general idea of what the project goals are. He added that he is satisfied with the current product and that the bullet points will also be used to guide the consultants as well as gauge the RFP responses.

Rick commented that although he was concerned that the earlier drafts didn't convey the Commission's desire for something exceptional – because Carbondale is a model community and he would like the document to capture the conviction that as Carbondale grows it is important to retain bike and pedestrian corridors for transportation. Rick acknowledged that those ideals are more strongly represented in the current draft.

Matt explained that one item that he wants to ensure is contained in the plan is that growth is factored into it, especially considering the anticipated development of Downtown North.

Rick concurred, commenting that he wants the plan to be sustainable and that it should be proactive, not reactive.

Matt noted that that is contained in the second bullet point: "Provide a road map to preserve and strengthen Carbondale's pedestrian and bike infrastructure in a rapidly changing environment."

Rick noted that one of the changes he suggested that wasn't included in the current draft was under the first bullet point on page 2 "Develop an interconnected, integrated, and safe multi-modal system" he had asked to add: "that is sustainable as Carbondale grows and is a critical element in the Town's planning and development and approval process."

Kevin replied that the consultant only has control over developing a plan that interconnects the various goals and objectives and then it is incumbent upon Town staff, the Board of Trustees and the Bike, Pedestrian and Trails Commission to follow up in codifying those recommendations in the Unified Development Code.

Rick thought that the consultant should at least be able to make recommendations about how the plan is used. He conceded that there was some redundancy in the RFP and these items may be included in other passages.

Matt suggested retaining the first part of Rick's statement and substitute "consider this in all growth and development decisions."

Alex thought it was important to include the term “Sustainability,” even though the concept is touched on in other ways. He agreed with Kevin that it is the BPTC’s responsibility to make sure it is included in planning reviews.

David noted that while there are two sections comprising the RFP -- a section of background and objectives, there is also another section that describes the scope of services – and asked for an explanation of the difference between the two.

Kevin replied that the Background and Objectives section is a broad statement, while the Scope of Services is not specific to a concept, but to a task.

David pointed out that one of the bullet points in the Background and Objectives section states, “Ensure the planning and development process considers pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure as a critical element,” and wondered if that concept had been captured in the Scope of Services.

Matt replied that from his perspective, consultants responding to the RFP will develop recommendations in accordance with the scope of services and will do so by taking into consideration the stated background and objectives. He thought it might be helpful to add a bullet point to that effect.

Chris thought that the first bullet point under Scope of Services captured the spirit of the background and objectives but thought the point could be elaborated by referring to the nine goals and objectives listed.

Kevin replied that David’s question ties back to his previous comment – what they are telling the consultant is that they want this plan to be used for that purpose, but directing developers to use it should come through the UDC and not this plan. He explained that the reason for that is because if you tell too many people that they must look through too many documents, it might be missed, but if it is in the UDC it can be clearly spelled out and captured during the planning process.

Matt commented that he wants the consultant to say, “these are ways in which you might alter your development plan to accommodate a multi-modal plan,” and then the Town can decide how to incorporate it into the UDC.

David agreed and thought they if items aren’t addressed those will be captured through the review process.

Kevin thought that was a good point and pointed out that the Commission will continue to be involved throughout the development of the plan.

Chris thought the RFP was well done.

Alex agreed with Chris. He noted that he didn’t see anything in the objectives regarding minimum design standards and wondered if it could be included as an objective or deliverable.

Matt thought that was a good point.

Chris pointed out that the Complete Streets policy that includes strategies for traffic calming is included in the Backgrounds and Objectives section.

Rick thought that was an oversimplification of the Complete Streets concepts and he thought that that should have been expanded.

Chris pushed back, explaining that his interpretation of Complete Streets was an urban solution and because Carbondale only has about 20 streets -- each of which presents its own unique set of circumstances -- it would be difficult to develop standards that could be applied equally.

Matt replied that the Complete Streets concepts can be anything you want them to be. He added that one of the most important things to come out of the Multi-modal Plan is not just what the Town is today, but what the Town is going to be in the future. He stressed the importance of denoting how the streets are used, how they are going to be used and how they can be designed to fit that use. He thought that was one of the most important items they will get back from this process.

Chris commented that while he understood the objectives, he thought being too detailed with the design standards seems like it may lock you into one mode that may become unworkable. He added that he thought Highway 133 was one corridor that everyone can agree needs standards and that there might be some corridors that can be identified for continuity and connectivity, as well.

Matt replied that if consultants are addressing traffic calming, interconnected systems, or pedestrian patterns, it will be hard not to include design standards.

Kevin added that under the third point in the scope of services, the second bullet point states "Evaluation of primary and secondary road and non-motorized bicycle, pedestrian, and trail uses. Analysis of how these uses will be impacted or change due to growth. Recommendations and design alternatives based on current and future uses and gaps which will achieve the town's multi-modal objectives." He noted that they are specifically asking for alternatives because they don't want to be dictated measurements.

Alex commented that he wants to push for consistency across town – that crosswalks look the same regardless of their location, for example.

Rick wondered if the reference to Complete Streets in the last bullet point on page 1 should be deleted. He explained that in his opinion Complete Streets means more than just traffic calming.

Matt agreed that Complete Streets means different things, and if the consultant recommends that it is helpful for fundraising, for example, those concepts will be useful. He did think that the page 1 reference could be taken out.

Alex pointed out that the bullet points at the top of page 2 touch on many of the Complete Streets elements.

David noted that Complete Streets is also referenced on page 2: "When developing the M3AP, the selected consultant should ensure that components of the plan are consistent with the principals of Complete Streets and Vision Zero as well as the Bike, Pedestrian and Trails Commission's definition of a multi-modal corridor," and also thought the isolated reference on page 1 could be deleted.

Kevin noted that the bullet points listed on pages 1 and 2 came directly out of the Comprehensive Plan and they could be left in or taken out. He appreciated Alex's comment regarding uniformity and suggested adding "including standardization of multi-modal techniques utilized throughout the town" to Item 3, bullet point 2 in the Scope of Services Section. Kevin added that he will also recommend that at least one commission member be included on the RFP selection committee.

Rick asked what the timeline was for RFP advertisement and selection.

Kevin replied that it would be placed on the Board of Trustees agenda for approval in March, with the consultant selection taking place in April.

Kevin reminded the commission members about the upcoming check-in with the Board of Trustees on Tuesday, February 21st and suggested that the Multi-Modal Mobility and Access Plan be promoted at that time.

Matt commented that he is planning to attend the check-in and welcomed anyone else who would like to attend.

ADJOURNMENT

The February 13, 2023, regular meeting adjourned at 6:56 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for March 6, 2023, at 6:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Kae McDonald