



## Meeting Summary

\* = Approval Item

### 1. Introductions / Agenda Review

- The meeting was called to order by Andrea Crouse, BPAC Chair. Introductions were made around the room and online.

### 2. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

- Approval of meeting notes from August 1, 2024
- BPAC Goals:
  - Safe all season design for bike/ped infrastructure
  - Addressing network gaps
  - Education and training ops
    - Carol discussed the potential for a winter maintenance workshop in 2025
    - Prescott notified the committee on an upcoming Title VI survey for members to complete, with the aim of analyzing demographics of committees for the MIC
- Update member list – later in 2025
  - We have a really engaged group of voting members as well as non-voting frequent attendees.
  - We have lost track of terms (i.e. when people started serving as voting members).
  - There are now two voting member slots open as both Jason DiPiazza and Dick Haney have stepped down. Both of these slots need to be filled.
  - The BPAC member list will be updated later in 2025 after the new MIC staff is hired.
- Subcommittee updates – and current MIC staff capacity
  - No Bike or Pedestrian subcommittee updates as there have been no meetings.
  - Until MIC is able to hire a new staff person the Subcommittees will not meet. Acting staff time will be spent on coordinating revision/update of the Bicycle Transportation Plan and BPAC quarterly meetings.
- Confirmation of future meeting dates:
  - Special BPAC Meeting – final acceptance/vote on the 2025 Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Bicycle Transportation Plan – March 6, 2025
  - BPAC – May 1, 2025, 2:30-4:30 at MnDOT
  - No Bike or Pedestrian subcommittee meetings until otherwise noted

### 3. TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

- 2025 Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Bicycle Transportation Plan Review
  - Status & Updates of Process & Timeline (Andrea, Mike)
    - Nov '24 Mike W became MIC acting coordinator of BPAC
    - Dec 12, 2024 – some BPAC members met at ARDC, most time spent marking up maps.
    - Chapters 1,2,3, and 5 were made available for input using Google Docs.



## Meeting Summary

\* = Approval Item

- Carol, James, Andrea, Mike, Ricky, and Elanor reviewed existing document and synthesized input.
- Subgroup of BPAC developed a project prioritization metric.
- New for this plan is a prioritization approach, priority mapping, and project lists – combing the projects and the priority maps.
- Updated maps were created for Chapter 4.
- Today is not a brainstorming session. Instead, we will summarize and review major changes to the plan and pull together loose ends.
- Next steps will be to include comments from the upcoming public Open House for the plan at Dovetail Café/Folk School on February 13 (3:30-5 PM).
- Prioritization Approach
  - The overall network on the map is being prioritized by segment (same as ped plan), not by specific called out projects. Benefits include this may ID segments that are high priority for which there's no project on the jurisdiction's radar yet.
  - Skip asked what we mean by prioritizing the network - that sounds jargony. Make sure the related chapter explains the intent (it shows the level of need). When Dick used to say, "we need to prioritize the network". In the Pedestrian plan it's the "Priority Ped Improvement Corridors".
  - Maren said gaps may show up using the model, but the new priority map will help with that.
  - Did end up removing High/low etc. # of trucks, Designated truck route, Bike count data, and Ambulatory difficulty from the prioritization criteria. Those made sense for pedestrians, but less so for bicycling.
  - The map doesn't remove segments that are completed.
  - JG: Toole has a "level of traffic stress" that we should eventually use. We need that to combine with this "level of importance" that Ricky is making now. Might show that even though a road has bike lanes that may or may not suffice to address the need and level of stress.
  - Skip: the plan needs to say "a network completed will operate more efficiently". Mike suggests Elinor and Skip talk (JG, AC, CA) to try to capture that in a paragraph.
- Things we may want to add to Chapter 4:
  - Expected future development
  - Type of bike facility planned – if jurisdiction is comfortable with that
  - Key gaps (maybe comment on the priority of gaps and improvements in reducing gaps)
- Use the same focused areas as the 2019 plan + Blatnick bridge area.



## Meeting Summary

\* = Approval Item

- Skip: cautionary tale: make sure the data is telling us what we think it is/should. We need to ground truth and be prepared to update. Also capture what data we need going forward. (e.g. crash/incident reporting, etc.). James G responded: content should make clear (like a protocol) how a jurisdiction should use the plan. Idea: add a 1-pager on implementation authorized for jurisdictions, including drawing their attention to key policies – could be a cover letter to go with the plan from the MIC to all MIC jurisdictions encouraging them to make use of it, pointing out briefly how, and inviting them to let MIC know as they use it things like “this is wrong because ...” or “it would help to have this addressed next update...” etc.
- Ricky noted that bike count data is not being used for the mapping exercise / prioritization approach.
- The final maps will be color coded.
  
- Other comments regarding the development of the 2025 Duluth-Superior Metropolitan Bicycle Transportation Plan:
  - Outcome of this plan: JG says the bottom-line goal is to have the recommended roads done by 2050. JG – we don’t have enough baseline data to set goals/objectives.
  - Judy – student level of use – existing plan suggests counting # of bikes at schools 1/month. Can we add who/how that will happen? MW: consider additional specific actions. JG says that is one thing we did and are still doing. What are our needs re building infrastructure to collect data.
  - Bike boulevards – Skip likes that we added to maps and will use more.
  - Judy – typo on page 13 – no way NOW how should be NO HOW
  - Mimi S: chapter 3 ... if you dive into page 21 “actual plan” with graphic regarding all ages and abilities. That particular graphic is segregatory in the way it’s framed. Its an old way of framing and categorizing groups of people. Mimi can send us the updated version that she found. NACTO also changed how in their 2025 version they have a new graphic / explanation of all ages and abilities. Great that the plan includes this, just make sure it’s updated.
  - Ch. 1 – Maren W – the goals actually ARE updated from the 2019 plan. AC – yes we realized what we started with as doc to mark up in Google docs were Prescott’s “in progress”
  - Federal rules and guidance – James G pointed out those need updating. Page 4. J asked if Mike W has time to update that – 23 CFR 450 ... Yes, Mike can update federal code references.
  - Ch. 5 – coms – the NPO is doing the whole Safety Action plan. SS4A. both planning (now) to get eligible hypothetically for funding.



## Meeting Summary

\* = Approval Item

- Ensure someplace (Ch. 1?) there's a paragraph that refers to related plans, such as the Pedestrian Plan.
- Ch. 6 is brand new! Project List – Mike W: do we also cover policies, which can be as important as projects? Maren – some policies are in the plan, but it could be improved. Example: some jurisdictions have different policies or follow the plan differently, so we can a) ensure plan captures key policy recommendations and b) use a cover letter to jurisdictions to encourage them to adopt them. Mike W #1 thing they hear for bike and pedestrian work is snow removal, which is a policy issue. When working on the MTP there was so much focus on projects as how we implement the plan, but policy is also important. James G: asked if we should do better at calling out or summarizing policies in the Bike Plan? Maren believes this is something BPAC might need to work on as we implement the plan. Andrea C made note of the BPAC role to make policy recommendations.
- Ch. 7 = new = explanation of the prioritization
- Mike W recommends a report card noting implemented bike projects over last X years. Could do that pretty easily – James G has that for facilities. But we don't have counts. He said they set a goal of increasing bike rates X%. but without data they cannot address if that's happening. Mike W suggested/recommended we take steps toward getting this data.
- James G's response to a progress report:
  - In 2019 MIC had 30 miles of bikeways. In last 5 years we added about 10 miles: 3 miles conventional, 1 mile buffered, 4.5 shared use path and rest = protected bike lanes. Much of this happened 2023-2024.
  - Existing major gaps called out 10 of them. He has status on each one of them. Of those 10 only 5 haven't been addressed at all. 5 have been at least partially or full addressed.
  - 10 new routes ... includes connection to Bong bridge from 1<sup>st</sup> St. etc. Cody St in W Duluth ... looking at eventual connection up the hill to Proctor using a combination of existing old roadway and location TBD
  - Campus connector trail study area by Arlington
  - Snively Road to Vermillion Road – connection as future bike facility (SW narrow...)
  - 8<sup>th</sup> St bike blvd to Wallace
  - 34<sup>th</sup> Ave E
  - London Rd .. out east 40<sup>th</sup> Ave ...
  - Jefferson St as Bike Blvd



## Meeting Summary

\* = Approval Item

- 14<sup>th</sup> Ave E future bike facility
- Railroad St. – better connection to Bayfront

### 4. INFORM/UPDATE – UPCOMING GRANTS

- Grant for SLC = Arrowhead Road - MnDOT AT planning grant
- City got planning grant for 2<sup>nd</sup> St from MnDOT Mesaba to 6<sup>th</sup> Ave E
- City applied for a TA grant for micromobility hub in front of Essentia new tower on Superior St., waiting for response.
- CRP request for bike parking funding goes to the ATP next week.
- Block Grant 6<sup>th</sup> Ave E to Mesaba full reconstruct and B/P improvement
- Cari P: most federal discretionary projects are on hold. Is TA discretionary? James G: no, that's more formula. RAISE is discretionary.
- London road public meetings; Mesaba Ave bridge repair project for 2026 construction – will cause roads underneath and those sidewalks to need detours Feb 25 at Duluth public Library green room. 2029 project Lester River Bridge to Expressway – ICE studies w b/p consideration March 26 public meeting. For this construction season they have list of projects for whole region – she'll share that link.

### 5. ROUND TABLE:

- Judy G: last time the aerial lift bridge was repaired the old decking was salvaged and used by UMD who used it to build their Rock Hill overlook at little bridges over Tischer Creek. Cari P – giving to contractor to dispose of but if had a home could keep it. Bring this to the attention of the Rice Lake Road project team – they could be used for the trail over wetlands with addition of something like old conveyor belt on top.
- Zeitgeist got small grant from GM to do a transportation academy to learn how to get involved in policy and advocacy around projects, and to create a better informed public. 12 to 20 people is the goal, stipends available, maybe college credit from University.
- Didn't get the Reconnecting Communities grant for 6<sup>th</sup> Ave E. Really successful public meeting last Thursday - packed house, most from the neighborhood. Seeing improvements for pedestrians from last plans. Video of the presentation will be up on their website soon. The plans are posted there.
- DTA will be offering free rides for college and high school students. Found another way to pay for it, plus faculty and staff.
- 40<sup>th</sup> Ave W – Andrea is interested in including the bus stop / parklet idea.
- Cari P: Ecklund public meeting next week at Baptist Church on Ecklund in Duluth Heights above the mall “cut through” from Arrowhead. 5:30 presentation.
- Mimi – please check out Be Minnesnowta Nice promos on Social Media.

### 6. ADJOURN: