

Purpose of the Bicycle Master Plan



To establish policies, procedures, and standards that improve safety and mobility for bicyclists and increase the number of trips taken by bicycle. The Bicycle Master Plan creates a list of prioritized projects and initiatives to be implemented over the next 30 years and assigns responsibilities and strategies for implementation.



The Vision



All bicyclists enjoy a welcoming environment; riding safely, efficiently, and conveniently within the City of Minneapolis year-round.



Bicycle Master Plan Guiding Principles



- 1. Improve Safety**—Safety is considered first and foremost. Goals, objectives, and policies must consider the safety of bicyclists and other users in a corridor
- 2. Improve Mobility**—Goals, objectives, and policies should make it easier for bicyclists to move throughout the city more efficiently. Mobility should be enhanced for all types of bicyclists and should better facilitate all types of trips. (Types of bicyclists: AASHTO A,B,C type riders; Types of trips include transportation, recreation, utilitarian use.)
- 3. Increase the Numbers of Bicyclists**—Goals, objectives, and policies should facilitate more bikers. Increasing bicycling mode share is more than a goal; it is one of the fundamental values that drive the bicycle program.
- 4. Modal Equity**— Goals, objectives, and policies need to reflect the overall need for space in a corridor or a travelshed. Efforts should be made to balance the needs of pedestrians, transit, freight, motor vehicles, and bicyclists.
- 5. Community Support**—Goals, objectives, and policies need to work toward improving the community. Efforts should be made to facilitate neighborhood input and respect property rights.
- 6. Cost Effectiveness**—Goals, objectives, and policies need to guide projects and initiatives that consider capital costs in addition to operation and maintenance costs. The value of a project or initiative should consider both cost and need. Both public and private funding partnerships are strongly encouraged.

Document Outline (June 2008):

As can be seen in the following outline the document will cover the following components:

Chapter 1: Introduction – Brief overview of document

Purpose of the Bicycle Master Plan

Community input process

Vision

Guiding principles

Goals, objectives, and benchmarks

Identification of projects and initiatives

Prioritization of projects and initiatives

Standards and procedures

Chapter 2: Existing Program -

Existing Program – Overview of existing conditions and existing projects and initiatives

Benefits of Biking

Existing and Previous Conditions

Process for Last Bike Plan and Progress Made Since Last Plan

Types of Users and Types of Bicycle Trips

Mpls BAC Membership, Roles, and Responsibilities

Comprehensive Plan Policies

10-Year Transportation Plan Policies and Directives

Chapter 3: Goals and Policy Framework - Goals, objectives, and benchmarks are identified based on comprehensive plan policies. Goals and policies are organized by bicycle program category.

Encouragement

Education

Engineering

Enforcement

Evaluation

Equity

Chapter 4: Project and Initiative Needs Analysis -

Determining bicycle demand and bicyclists needs

Access to destinations

Encouragement

Promoting the Benefits of Biking

Bike to Work Initiatives

Bike Share Project

Neighborhood bicycling

Tourism Initiatives

Education

Safe Routes to School program

Educating the public using the media

Engineering

Infrastructure gaps and discontinuities

Identification of substandard and aging bikeways and development of bikeways cleanup and renovation program

2008 Minneapolis Bikeways Master Plan

Crash reduction initiatives

Transit/bike projects

Enforcement

Public safety needs

Bike Bait Program

Evaluation

Measuring Success - Discussion on how the program will be measured and how success will be determined.

Resource needs

Equity

Geographic needs

Demographic needs

Transportation mode integration needs

Chapter 5: Prioritizing Projects and Initiatives—Bicycle projects are prioritized into three tiers for implementation. Projects and initiatives are sorted and prioritized by the Minneapolis BAC.

Encouragement

Promoting the Benefits of Biking

Bike to Work Initiatives

Bike Share Project

Neighborhood bicycling

Tourism Initiatives

Education

Safe Routes to School program

Public Service Announcements

Engineering

Bikeways Phasing Plan

Phase 1 map

Phase 2 map

Phase 3 map

Capital costs

Maintenance and operations costs

Bikeway Functional Classification

Intersection needs

Bicycle parking needs

Enforcement

Public Safety needs

Bike Bait Program

Evaluation

Counts, surveys, reporting

Equity

Geographic Equity

Demographic Equity

Modal Equity

Chapter 6: Funding and Implementation Strategies—Funding and implementation strategies are discussed to maximize possible resources and to minimize internal competition for funds.

Capital Funding

Operations and Maintenance Funding

Chapter 7: Standards and Procedures

Bicycle Design Standards

Maintenance Policies, Roles, and Responsibilities – Clarification on how future projects will be maintained, which agency will maintain a project, and maintenance expectation.

Development Requirements - New recommendations for new developments

Community Process Policy – Policies and procedures for how community members introduce bicycle project ideas for a given agency. Flow charts will accompany the various agency policies and procedures.

Appendix:

Bike Plan Maps – Similar to the 2001 map, this identifies future routes and route types.

Project/Initiative Cost Estimates and Timelines – Cost estimates and timelines are prepared for identified projects and initiatives

Bicycle Friendly Design Tool Box – Technical tool box treatments to be used on future projects.

Design Guidelines for Trails (includes safety/security/lighting, widths, hours, etc.)

Design Guidelines for Bike Lanes

Design Guidelines for Intersection Treatments - Includes evaluation of on-street intersection treatments and trail crossings at intersections

Design Guidelines for Shared Use Lanes - Includes evaluation of wide outside lanes on minor arterials, share the road signage, bicycle chevrons, etc.

Design Guidelines for Trail Crossings - Includes evaluation of mid-block trail crossings

Design Guidelines for Railroad Crossings - Includes evaluation of on-street railroad crossings and trails that cross railroads

Design Guidelines for Bikeway Detours

Design Guidelines for Bicycle Boulevards

Design Guidelines for Wayfinding and Informational Signage

Innovative Treatments – For use in unique circumstances

BAC Roles and Responsibilities – Refinement on how the BAC functions, BAC membership, and identification of responsibility.

Timeline:

The following timeline has been established with regard to the Bicycle Master Plan:

November 2007 – Definition of roles and responsibilities. Delegation of project components to project partners. Project expectations clearly defined.

December 2007 – Goals and policy framework completed and presented to BAC for input. Maintenance policy and public input policy discussions begin. Research existing citywide plans to ensure consistency.

January 2008 – Needs analysis completed based on input from previous NTP open house, BAC input, and PW feedback. Needs analysis to include trails, bike lanes, bicycle parking, education, enforcement, tourism, transit connections, and safety initiatives. Start design guideline discussions in alignment with 10-Year Transportation Action Plan.

February 2008 – Prioritizing projects and initiatives. Determine cost estimates and timelines for various projects. BAC will be responsible for prioritization. Continue design guideline discussions in alignment with 10-Year Transportation Action Plan.

March 2008 – Determine funding and implementation strategies for various projects and initiatives. Determine how to measure success. Continue design guideline discussions in alignment with 10-Year Transportation Action Plan.

April 2008 – Public open house held to solicit public input on draft routes and draft policies. Complete design guideline discussions in alignment with 10-Year Transportation Action Plan.

May 2008 – Refine chapters based on public input. Complete bike plan maps.

June 2008 – Work on detailed design standards for trails, bike lanes, and shared use lanes. Discussions regarding shared use facilities with vehicles, pedestrians, and buses.

July 2008 – Work on detailed design standards for trail crossings, bikeway detours, and wayfinding and informational signage.

August 2008 – Work on detailed innovative treatments toolbox.

September 2008 – Complete maintenance policy for bikeways.

October 2008 – Complete community process policy and revisit BAC roles and responsibilities.

November 2008 – Draft Plan presented to BAC for final comments.

December 2008 – Final Plan presented to the City Council, MPRB, and School Board for approval.

Definitions:

Vision – A vision is a broad mission statement that illustrates where the program intends to be in the future. The vision is optimistic and can be achieved by meeting goals and objectives.

Guiding Principle – Basic philosophy on how goals and objectives should be achieved. Guiding principles should help guide priorities and should represent the sentiment and values of the elected officials, staff, advocates, and the public. All goals and objectives must follow one or more guiding principle. Guiding Principles must be in compliance with the Minneapolis Comprehensive Plan.

Goal – The desired end result. Goals are general in nature, the product of specific objectives or a specific objective. A goal is finished when the desired end result has been achieved. However, goals are not considered successful unless the terms in all of the defined objectives have been satisfied or attempted in the timeframe prescribed.

Objective – How the desired end result is achieved. The path or strategy to reach the goal is defined as an objective. There are usually many ways to achieve a goal. Objectives involve specific projects and initiatives, whereas goals are the desired product of those specific projects and initiatives.

Benchmarks – Checkpoints to measure progress in the process of achieving a desired end result. Benchmarks are significant events such as the end of a given project or initiative and often measure the success of objectives. It is recommended that benchmark goals be set in 5-year increments to coincide with the Bicycle Master Plan planning update process.

Performance Measure – Means of measuring success. Typical measuring tools could include bicycle counts, bike rack inventory, crash reports, surveys, number of maps/brochures distributed, or miles of facilities completed.

Responsibility – Identification of agency or group responsible for carrying out objective, benchmarks, and performance measures

Strategy – Strategies identify tactics to accomplish a given objective and there may be multiple approaches to accomplish each objective.

Standard – A mandatory design condition in which a technical detail must be adhered. A standard often defines extreme values and can only be altered with a variance.

Guidance – A recommended design condition that reflects best practices in an urban setting.

Variance – Strategies identify tactics to accomplish a given objective and there may be multiple approaches to accomplish each objective.

2008 Comprehensive Plan Policies Relating to Bicycles:

Minneapolis Plan: Land Use Policy 1.3 – Ensure that development plans incorporate appropriate transportation access and facilities, particularly for bicycle, pedestrian, and transit.

Minneapolis Plan: Land Use Policy 1.16 – Support a limited number of Major Retail Centers, while promoting their compatibility with the surrounding area and their accessibility to transit, bicycle, and foot traffic.

Minneapolis Plan: Transportation Policy 2.1 – Encourage growth and reinvestment by developing a multi-modal transportation system that includes light rail, commuter rail, intercity high speed rail, streetcars, high frequency buses, and other modes.

Minneapolis Plan: Transportation Policy 2.1.1 – Address the needs of all modes of transportation, emphasizing the development of a more effective transit network.

Minneapolis Plan: Transportation Policy 2.5 – Ensure that bicycling throughout the city is safe, comfortable and pleasant.

Minneapolis Plan: Transportation Policy 2.5.1 – Complete a network of on and off-street primary bicycle corridors where bicycles are given priority.

Minneapolis Plan: Transportation Policy 2.5.2 – Strive to accommodate bicycles on all streets but, when other modes take priority in a corridor, provide accessible alternate routes.

Minneapolis Plan: Transportation Policy 2.8 – Manage parking in line with objectives for improving the environment for transit, walking, and bicycling.

Minneapolis Plan: Transportation Policy 2.10 – Support the development of a multi-modal downtown transportation system that encourages an increasingly dense and vibrant regional center.

Minneapolis Plan: Economic Development Policy 4.13 – Downtown will continue to be the most sustainable place to do business in the metro area.

Minneapolis Plan: Public Services and Facilities Policy 5.2 – The City of Minneapolis will support the efforts of public and private institutions to provide a wide range of educational choices for Minneapolis students and residents throughout the city.

Minneapolis Plan: Public Services and Facilities Policy 5.4 – Minneapolis will enhance the safety, appearance, and effectiveness of its infrastructure.

Minneapolis Plan: Public Services and Facilities Policy 5.4.1 – Maintain and improve the quality and condition of public streets, sidewalks, bridges, water systems, and other public infrastructure.

Minneapolis Plan: Public Services and Facilities Policy 5.7 – Minneapolis will protect and improve individual, community, and environmental health.

Minneapolis Plan: Environment Policy 6.2 – Minneapolis will protect and enhance air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Minneapolis Plan: Environment Policy 6.2.4 – Endorse the use of alternative modes of transportation such as public transit, bicycles, car and bike share programs, and carpools, as well as promote alternative work schedules.

Minneapolis Plan: Open Space and Parks 7.1 – Promote the physical and mental health of residents and visitors by providing safe outdoor amenities and spaces that support exercise, play, relaxation, and socializing.

Minneapolis Plan: Open Space and Parks 7.6 – Continue to beautify open spaces through well designed landscaping that complements and improves the City's urban form on many scales – from street trees to expansive views of lakes and rivers.

Minneapolis Plan: Open Space and Parks 7.8 – Strengthen existing and create new partnerships, including public-private partnerships, to deliver the best park

Minneapolis Plan: Urban Design 8.5 – New multi-family development or renovation should be designed in terms of traditional urban building form with pedestrian scale features at the street level.

Minneapolis Plan: Urban Design 8.19 – Promote an attractive environment by minimizing visual clutter and confusion caused by a proliferation of signage.

Minneapolis Plan: Urban Design 8.22 – Preserve the natural ecology and the historical features that define Minneapolis' unique identity in the region.

Minneapolis Plan: Urban Design 8.22.3 – Increase public recreational access to and across the river in the form of parks, cyclist/pedestrian bridges, greenways and trails along the river.

Engineering: Goals, Objectives, and Benchmarks (June 2008)

- . Goal #1 – Increase the number of miles of bikeways within the city.
 - o Objective #1a – Increase the number of bike lanes:
 - . Benchmark #1a – Double the number of bike lanes (40 additional miles of bike lanes) by 2010. Quadruple the number of bike lanes (80 additional miles) by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #1a – Number of lane miles.
 - . Responsibility #1a – City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, MPRB.
 - o Objective #1b – Increase the number of trails:
 - . Benchmark #1b – Add 20 miles of additional trails by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #1b – Number of lane miles.
 - . Responsibility #1b – City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, MPRB.
 - o Objective #1c – Increase maintenance funding for bikeways to keep up with capital funding for bikeways and to maintain arterial facilities year-round:
 - . Benchmark #1c – Find enough funding to keep with 2020 goals.
 - . Performance Measure #1c – Revenue secured.
 - . Responsibility #1c – City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, MPRB.
 - o Objective #1d – Complete all routes identified in the 2020 proposed bikeways master plan map:
 - . Benchmark #1d – 50% of proposed improvements completed by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #1d – Number of miles of facilities.
 - . Responsibility #1d – City of Minneapolis, MPRB, Hennepin County, MnDOT.
- . Goal #2 - Double the amount of bicycle parking available to the public by 2020.
 - o Objective #1a – Double the amount of bicycle parking available to the public (including lockers and showers) through the citywide 50/50 cost share program and through special grants:
 - . Benchmark #1a – Double the number of bicycle parking spaces by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #1a – Number of bike racks.
 - . Responsibility #1a – City of Minneapolis, MPRB, local businesses.
 - o Objective #1b – Ensure that schools, parks, post offices, businesses and public buildings have bike racks:
 - . Benchmark #1a – 100% of schools, parks, and post offices will have bike racks by 2010. 100% of public buildings will have bike racks by 2012. 100% of major business nodes will have bike racks by 2015.
 - . Performance Measure #1a – Number of bike racks.
 - . Responsibility #1a – City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, MPRB, local businesses.
 - o Objective #1c – Distribute a citywide bicycle parking guide for public distribution to encourage businesses to install bike racks:
 - . Benchmark #1c – Publication distributed by the end of 2009.
 - . Performance Measure #1c – Number of brochures distributed.
 - . Responsibility #1c – City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, MPRB, local businesses.
- . Goal #3 - Create an environment where all streets are bicycle friendly:
 - o Objective #3a – Provide bicycle facilities such that all residents are within 1 mile of an off-street trail, within ½ mile of an on-street bike lane, and within ¼ mile of a signed route:
 - . Benchmark #3a – 100% of residents have a trail within 1 mile by 2020, a bike lane within ½ mile, and a signed bike route with ¼ mile by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #3a – Percentage of density requirement satisfied.
 - . Responsibility #3a – City of Minneapolis, MPRB, Hennepin County.
 - o Objective #3b – Make all intersections accessible and safe for cyclists:
 - . Benchmark #3b – 100% of actuated intersections with bicycle detection by 2015, 100% of intersections evaluated for cyclists needs by 2020 and appropriate pavement markings and signage installed.
 - . Performance Measure #3b – Percentage of intersections improved.
 - . Responsibility #3b – City of Minneapolis, MPRB, Hennepin County.
- . Goal #4 - Ensure that all existing trails are safely marked, signed, appropriately lighted, and address personal safety.
 - o Objective #4 – Complete safety improvements for all existing trails:
 - . Benchmark #4 – 100% of trails improved by 2015.
 - . Performance Measure #4 – Percentage of crosswalks evaluated.
 - . Responsibility #4 – City of Minneapolis, MPRB, Hennepin County.
- . Goal #5 – Complete and implement design standards for all bikeways:
 - o Objective #5a – Provide safe mid-block trail crossings:
 - . Benchmark #5a – 100% of existing mid-block crosswalks improved by 2015. Standards for new crosswalks adopted in 2008.
 - . Performance Measure #5a – Percentage of crosswalks evaluated.
 - . Responsibility #5a – City of Minneapolis, MPRB, Hennepin County.
 - o Objective #5b – Provide bicycle detour routes:
 - . Benchmark #5b – 100% of bikeways require a detour route when closed starting in 2008. Standards for new detour routes adopted in 2008.
 - . Performance Measure #5b – Percentage of closed bikeways receiving a detour route.
 - . Responsibility #5b – City of Minneapolis, MPRB, Hennepin County.
 - o Objective #5c – Provide wayfinding and informational signage:
 - . Benchmark #5c – 100% of existing bikeways to have wayfinding and informational signage by 2015. All new bikeways to have wayfinding and informational signage starting in 2008.
 - . Performance Measure #5c – Percentage of bikeways in compliance.
 - . Responsibility #5c – City of Minneapolis, MPRB, Hennepin County.
 - o Objective #5d – Provide bicycle lane widths, trail widths, signage, and markings that meet or exceed Minnesota Bicycle Design Guidelines and AASHTO guidelines:
 - . Benchmark #5d – 100% of on-street bikeways meet or exceed standards by 2010.
 - . Performance Measure #5d – Percentage of bikeways in compliance.
 - . Responsibility #5d – City of Minneapolis, MPRB, Hennepin County.
 - o Objective #5e – Apply innovative treatments where appropriate:
 - . Benchmark #5e – Standards for innovative treatments adopted in 2008.
 - . Performance Measure #5e – Number of innovative treatments implemented.
 - . Responsibility #5e – City of Minneapolis, MPRB, Hennepin County, MnDOT.
- . Goal #6 – Increase capital and operating funding for bikeways.
 - o Objective #6a – Request additional grant funding for bike facilities:
 - . Benchmark #6a – 50% increase in grant funding by 2010, 75% increase by 2015, 100% increase by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #6a – Dollars secured
 - . Responsibility #6a – City of Minneapolis, MPRB, Hennepin County.
 - o Objective #6b – Maintain CIP funding in the City of Minneapolis and MPRB budgets:
 - . Benchmark #6b – Keep local funding proportionally level until 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #6b – Dollars secured
 - . Responsibility #6b – City of Minneapolis, MPRB, Hennepin County.
 - o Objective #6c – Increase bicycle program staff:
 - . Benchmark #6c – Secure adequate funding to allow for 6 full time permanent staff (includes bicycle ambassador program staff).
 - . Performance Measure #6c – Dollars secured
 - . Responsibility #6c – City of Minneapolis

Enforcement: Goals, Objectives, and Benchmarks (June 2008):

- . Goal #1 - Reduce the number of bicycle crashes and injuries and eliminate bicycle fatalities:
 - . Objective #1a - Establish a bicycle crash safety campaign:
 - . Benchmark #1a - Reduce crashes and injuries by 40% by 2010, 50% by 2015, and 60% by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #1a – Number of crashes observed.
 - . Responsibility #1a – Public Works, Minneapolis Police, MPRB Police, Bicycle Ambassadors, U of M.
 - . Objective #1b - Special emphasis is placed on safety between transit (buses and LRT) and bicyclists:
 - . Benchmark #1b - Reduce transit/bike crashes and injuries by 60% by 2010, 70% by 2015, and 80% by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #1b – Number of crashes observed.
 - . Responsibility #1b – Public Works, Minneapolis Police, MPRB Police, Metro Transit, U of M.
 - . Objective #1c - Special emphasis is placed on safety between freight (trucks and trains) and bicyclists:
 - . Benchmark #1c - Reduce freight/bike crashes and injuries by 70% by 2010, 80% by 2015, and 90% by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #1c – Number of crashes observed.
 - . Responsibility #1c – Public Works, Minneapolis Police, MPRB Police, RR companies.
- . Goal #2 - Increase helmet use:
 - . Objective #2 – Create a bicycle helmet safety campaign:
 - . Benchmark #2 - Increase helmet use by 25% by 2010, 35% by 2015, and 50% by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #2 – Number of injuries observed.
 - . Responsibility #2 – Public Works, Minneapolis Police, MPRB Police, Bicycle Ambassadors, HCMC.
- . Goal #3 - Create an environment where all bicyclists and motorists follow the rules of the road:
 - . Objective #3a – Create and secure funding for a bicycle enforcement campaign:
 - . Benchmark #3a – Traffic violations reduced by 25% by 2010, 35% by 2015, and 50% by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #3a – Number of tickets issues.
 - . Responsibility #3a – Minneapolis Police, MPRB Police, U of M Police.
 - . Objective #3b – Create and secure funding for a bicycle and motorist education campaign to promote the Rules of the Road:
 - . Benchmark #3b – Traffic violations reduced by 25% by 2010, 35% by 2015, and 50% by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #3b – Number of brochures issued, number of classes taught.
 - . Responsibility #3b – Minneapolis Bicycle Ambassadors.
 - . Objective #3c – Create a clear understanding of Minneapolis sidewalk riding rules:
 - . Benchmark #3b – Create a map and brochure by 2010 for public distribution.
 - . Performance Measure #3b – Number of brochures issued, number of tickets issued.
 - . Responsibility #3b – Minneapolis Bicycle Ambassadors, Minneapolis Police, MPRB Police.

Education: Goals, Objectives, and Benchmarks (June 2008)

- . Goal #1 - Establish and maintain bicycle education curriculum:
 - . Objective #1a – Establish and maintain bicycle education curriculum for all Minneapolis schools through the Safe Routes to School program:
 - . Benchmark #1a – Establish and maintain curriculum by 2010.
 - . Performance Measure #1a – Counts at bike racks, number of students taught.
 - . Responsibility #1a – Minneapolis Bicycle Ambassadors, Minneapolis Schools.
 - . Objective #1b – Institute policies at all Minneapolis schools that allow students to bike to school:
 - . Benchmark #1b – 10% of all students to bike to school by 2010, 15% by 2015, and 20% by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #1b – Counts at bike racks, student surveys.
 - . Responsibility #1b – Minneapolis Bicycle Ambassadors, Minneapolis Schools.
 - . Objective #1c – Establish and maintain a community bicycle education course available at no cost to the public:
 - . Benchmark #1c – 2% of all residents to receive training by 2010, 3% by 2015, and 4% by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #1c – number of people who take course.
 - . Responsibility #1c – Minneapolis Bicycle Ambassadors, MPRB, City of Minneapolis.
 - . Objective #1d – City of Minneapolis and MPRB planners, engineers, and elected officials to take a bicycle course on planning and design for bicycle facilities:
 - . Benchmark #1d – 10% of staff to receive training by 2010, 35% by 2015, and 50% by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #1d – number of people who take course.
 - . Responsibility #1d – MPRB, Minneapolis Public Works.

Encouragement: Goals, Objectives, and Benchmarks (June 2008)

- . Goal #1 - Increase the total number of trips by bicycle:
 - Objective #1a – Promote and encourage bicycling to community destinations:
 - . Benchmark #1a – Increase the total number of trips by bicycle by 10% each year.
 - . Performance Measure #1a – Citywide bicycle counts and counts at bike racks.
 - . Responsibility #1a – Minneapolis Bicycle Ambassadors, business owners, community organizations, churches, and neighborhoods.
 - Objective #1b – Promote and encourage bicycling to public destinations:
 - . Benchmark #1b – Increase the total number of trips by bicycle by 10% each year.
 - . Performance Measure #1b – Citywide bicycle counts and counts at bike racks.
 - . Responsibility #1b – Minneapolis Bicycle Ambassadors, City of Minneapolis, MPRB, Minneapolis Schools.
- . Goal #2 - Improve bicycle mode share (trips to work):
 - Objective #2 – Promote and encourage bicycling to work:
 - . Benchmark #2 – Increase bicycle mode share (trips to work) to 4% by 2010, 8% by 2015, and 12% by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #2 – Citywide bicycle counts and counts at bike racks.
 - . Responsibility #2 – Minneapolis Bicycle Ambassadors, City of Minneapolis, MPRB, Minneapolis Schools, Business Owners, Minneapolis TMO.
- . Goal #3 – Reduce bicycle thefts:
 - Objective #3a – Establish a bicycle anti-theft campaign including a bike bait program, anti-theft brochures, and press releases to reduce the number of bicycle thefts:
 - . Benchmark #3a – Reduce the number of bicycle thefts by 50% by 2010, 75% by 2015, and 85% by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #3a – Police Department statistics.
 - . Responsibility #3a – Minneapolis Bicycle Ambassadors, City of Minneapolis, MPRB Police, U of M Police.
 - Objective #3b – Work with schools and community groups to purchase secure bicycle locks and storage:
 - . Benchmark #3b – Reduce the number of bicycle thefts by 50% by 2010, 75% by 2015, and 85% by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #3b – Police Department statistics.
 - . Responsibility #3b – Minneapolis Bicycle Ambassadors, City of Minneapolis, MPRB Police, U of M Police.
- . Goal #4- Make it easier for residents and visitors to bike in the city:
 - Objective #4a – Complete a citywide bicycle map for public distribution by the end of 2008:
 - . Benchmark #4a – Complete bike map by end of 2008; revise every 2 years.
 - . Performance Measure #4a – Number of maps distributed.
 - . Responsibility #4a – Minneapolis Bicycle Ambassadors, City of Minneapolis, MPRB, U of M.
 - Objective #4b – Create a bicycling tourism packet to be distributed by local hotels and restaurants:
 - . Benchmark #4b – Complete packet by end of 2012; revise every 2 years.
 - . Performance Measure #4b – Number of packets distributed.
 - . Responsibility #4b – Minneapolis Bicycle Ambassadors, City of Minneapolis, Downtown Council, Meet Minneapolis local hotels and restaurants.
 - Objective #4c – Work with the bicycle industry to promote and expand bicycle rental locations within the city.
 - . Benchmark #4b – Double the number of locations where bikes can be rented by 2012; triple the number of locations by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #4b – Number of places to rent a bike.
 - . Responsibility #4b – Minneapolis Bicycle Ambassadors, City of Minneapolis, Downtown Council, Meet Minneapolis local hotels and restaurants.
- . Goal #5 – Promote the benefits of bicycling:
 - Objective #5a – Establish a permanent funding stream to maintain the bicycle ambassador program through 2020:
 - . Benchmark #5a – Budget secured on annual basis.
 - . Performance Measure #5a – Number of people served by the program.
 - . Responsibility #5a – Minneapolis Bicycle Ambassadors, City of Minneapolis, MPRB, Minneapolis Schools.
 - Objective #5b – Work with health and wellness industry to promote healthy lifestyles including bicycling:
 - . Benchmark #5b – Obesity rates decline by 2020, heart disease rates decline by 2020 due in part to bicycling.
 - . Performance Measure #5b – Grants awarded, number of people reached with promotional materials.
 - . Responsibility #5b – Minneapolis Bicycle Ambassadors, City of Minneapolis, MPRB, Minneapolis Schools.

Equity: Goals, Objectives, and Benchmarks:

- . Goal #1 – Modal Equity: Make Transit a bicycle friendly transportation option.
 - Objective #1a – Equip all buses (including suburban operators) with sufficient bicycle racks:
 - . Benchmark #1a – 75% of all buses by 2010, 85% of all buses by 2015, and 100% of all buses by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #1a – Percentage of buses.
 - . Responsibility #1a – Metro Transit, MVTA, SW Metro transit, Plymouth Metrolink, Maple Grove Transit.
 - Objective #1b – Ensure that all transit stops have adequate bicycle parking:
 - . Benchmark #1b – 50% of all bus stops by 2010, 75% of all bus stops by 2015, and 100% of all bus stops by 2020
 - . Performance Measure #1b – Percentage of bus stops improved; bus stops will be able to accommodate existing need plus future ridership growth.
 - . Responsibility #1b – Metro Transit, MVTA, SW Metro transit, Plymouth Metrolink, Maple Grove Transit.
- . Goal #2 – Modal Equity: Make park and bike a more convenient transportation option.
 - Objective #2 – Equip parking ramps with bicycle racks:
 - . Benchmark #2 – 100% of public ramps with bicycle racks and lockers by 2010.
 - . Performance Measure #2 – Percentage of ramps equipped.
 - . Responsibility #2 – City of Minneapolis.
- . Goal #3 - Geographical Equity: Connect bicycle facilities to all adjacent communities and neighborhoods within the city.
 - Objective #3 – Maintain relationships with all adjacent communities and neighborhoods within the city with regard to bikeways, education and promotion initiatives, and safety:
 - . Benchmark #3 – Bikeway connections to 75% of neighboring cities by 2012, trail connections to 100% of neighboring cities by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #3 – Number of cities connected to Minneapolis.
 - . Responsibility #3 – City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Ramsey County, all adjacent cities.
- . Goal #4 – Demographic Equity: To facilitate inter-agency and inter-community cooperation through networking and collaboration.
 - Objective #4 – The Bicycle Advisory Committee and BAC staff will work regularly with Hennepin County, Metro Transit, the U of M, MnDOT, Metropolitan Council, elected officials, Mpls Department of Health, and neighborhood groups on bicycle projects, initiatives, and policies to create a seamless environment for bicycling:
 - . Benchmark #4 – All mentioned agencies to be part of BAC membership by 2010.
 - . Performance Measure #4 – Number of agencies represented on BAC.
 - . Responsibility #4 – All agencies mentioned above.
 - Objective #4 – An effort will be made to target diverse communities:
 - . Benchmark #4 – Bicycle Ambassadors to target at least one diverse group each year.
 - . Performance Measure #4 – Number of diverse groups reached.
 - . Responsibility #4 – All agencies mentioned above.
- . Goal #5 – Geographic Equity: Encourage developers to construct trails and install bike lanes as part of development projects.
 - Objective #5a – Construct trails as part of developments:
 - . Benchmark #5a – 10% of developments to construct trails by 2012. 2% increase every year after 2012.
 - . Performance Measure #5a – Number of development projects.
 - . Responsibility #5a – City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, MPRB, Private developers.
 - Objective #5b – Install bike racks as part of developments:
 - . Benchmark #5b – 50% of all new developments to install bike racks by 2015, 100% of new developments to install bike racks by 2020.
 - . Performance Measure #5b – Number of development projects.
 - . Responsibility #5b – City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, MPRB, Private developers.

Standards:

Standard #1 – Unless otherwise noted, bicycle facilities must comply with the latest version of the Minnesota Bicycle Design Guidelines.

Standard #2 – Bicycle facilities on city and county roads should be designed to comply with Minneapolis Action Plan Design Guidelines. Design should also consider guidance from the

Standard #3 – Bicycle lanes are to be striped in the same direction of traffic flow unless unique circumstances warrant otherwise.

Standard #4 – Bicycle lanes are to be striped on the left side of one-way streets where transit is present unless unique circumstances warrant.

Standard #5 – Bicycle lanes are not to be striped on residential streets unless unique circumstances warrant.

Standard #6 – Trails should be separated whenever possible to avoid conflicts with pedestrians.

Standard #7 – New multi-use trails shall be constructed to a minimum width of 10 feet unless unique circumstances warrant. Separated trails should allow for at least 5 feet in each direction for bicycles. Separated trail widths of 16 to 20 feet are justified when bicycle volumes exceed an average of 500 users per day.

Standard #8 – Proposed trails shall preserve a standard 25 foot width for trail easements unless unique circumstances warrant.

Standard #9 – All trails shall have a minimum horizontal 2 foot clear zone unless otherwise prescribed by state or federal standards.

Standard #10 – A standard gutter pan should not be used as part of a bike lane. A saw-cut 5 foot wide gutter pan may be used in unique circumstances.

Standard #11 – All new freeway bridges shall be reconstructed to accommodate bicycles with a minimum of 12 feet of sidewalk on both sides of the bridge. All freeway bridges will also allow for 6 foot bike lanes within the street.

Standard #12 – Bicycle lanes should be striped to avoid manholes, catch basins, and other obstructions.

Standard #13 – Arterial trails and bike lanes should be installed before secondary facilities unless unique circumstances exist.

Strategies:

Strategy #1 – The City of Minneapolis, MPRB, and Minneapolis Schools recognize bicycling as a mode of transportation in addition to a form of recreation and will encourage bicycling for all purposes.

Strategy #2 – Minneapolis Public Schools, Non-Public Schools, and all Charter Schools within the city will encourage children of all ages to bike to school.

Strategy #3 – A maintenance and operations plan must be completed before a project can be constructed.

Strategy #4 – Minneapolis Ordinances need to be revised to require stronger bicycle parking requirements for new developments

Strategy #5 – The City of Minneapolis will reconstruct all streets and bridges over time to reasonably accommodate bicyclists.

Strategy #6 – Bicycle facilities, roads, and bridges shall be designed to meet AASHTO Guidelines and Minnesota State Bicycle Design Guidelines.

Strategy #7 - As funding warrants, streets will be evaluated for re-striping to better accommodate bicyclists needs.

Strategy #8 – New projects should not create new gaps or discontinuities in the bikeways system.

Strategy #9 – Trail corridors and access points that are identified on the bikeways master plan should be preserved as funding allows.

Strategy #10 – The City of Minneapolis will not assess for trail projects

Strategy #11 – The City of Minneapolis shall continue to fund and maintain a full-time bicycle coordinator.

Strategy #12 – Design of Bicycle Facilities must comply with AASHTO guidelines, MMUTCD guidance and Minnesota State Law. The City should work with actively work with government partners in the creation and implementation of design guidelines and standards.

Strategy #13 – Creativity and innovative treatments should be encouraged. Innovative treatments must follow the FHWA process for request for experimentation.

Strategy #14 – Creativity and innovative treatments should be encouraged. Innovative treatments must follow the FHWA process for request for experimentation.

Strategy #15 – Citizen or neighborhood participation is required for any new bicycle project.

Strategy #16 – The bicycle program will encourage diversity. Education and promotional projects and initiatives should reach out to diverse communities and groups for input and participation.