



Approved by BAC
07-Mar-2013

MINUTES

City of Flagstaff

BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, February 7, 2013
4:30 pm

City Hall, Staff Conference Room
211 West Aspen Avenue, Flagstaff, Arizona

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:35 pm. On roll call, the following Committee members were present:

Ken Lane, Chair
Richard Hall
Jodi Norris
Melanie Street

Members absent:

Dave Blanchard
Katie Sheridan

One vacancy

The following City staff was present:

Martin Ince, Multi-Modal Planner

Public present:

Heather Carter
Brian Cimala
Monaé Gunn
Alyssa Jeske
Kea Loewen
Erika Mazza, NAIPTA

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Announcements

Ms. Street asked about small, thin pieces of metal that she sees frequently on the roadway. The group said that these are the steel bristles from the brushes on street sweepers. She asked how often streets and bike lanes are cleared of cinders, and said there is an on-going problem with ice on the FUTS just east of downtown. Mr.

Ince said that the City's Public Works Department publishes its street sweeping schedule on its website.

2. Public Comment

Ms. Loewen introduced herself and several NAU nursing students in attendance, and reported that they are working on a class project to study bicycle and pedestrian safety and make recommendations for improvement.

Ms. Gunn introduced herself and several other journalism majors from NAU, and said she is interested in a story about the NAIPTA five-year transit plan.

3. Approval Of Minutes

Ms. Street made, and Ms. Norris seconded, a motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of October 4, 2012. The motion was approved unanimously (4-0).

II. NEW BUSINESS

1. NAIPTA five-year transit plan update

Erika Mazza, planning manager at NAIPTA, reported on their draft five-year plan update. She said they are considering a new route structure that will not rely on the "pulse" timing concept, as routes currently do. She presented three maps, which depict recommendations for the short, medium, and long term, and reported on coordination efforts with the Regional Plan process. Public outreach for the draft plan will begin on March 1, 2013.

The Committee asked about the proposal for a bike and bus-only lane on both sides of Milton Road, and expressed some concern about how the lane would be shared. For example, how do buses and bikes overtake each other when necessary. Ms. Mazza said that bus and bike lanes are used in Boulder, Davis, and Tucson. The Committee asked for additional information on how such facilities function in other places.

2. Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting dates for 2013

A schedule of regular meeting dates was provided to the BAC in their packets.

III. OLD BUSINESS

1. FUTS master planning

This item was held over to the March meeting.

2. Draft ADOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

Mr. Ince provided a brief overview of the plan and the planning process, and presented draft comments on the plan's strategies.

Following discussion, Ms. Norris made, and Ms. Street seconded, a motion to forward the following comments to ADOT, as written in the staff report and modified by discussion. The motion was approved unanimously (4-0).

Strategy 1

- Add pedestrians to third sentence, last paragraph of page 36
- Page 37, second bullet suggesting that development be concentrated is a good idea but outside of ADOT's jurisdiction or ability to control

Strategy 2

- In urban areas, it is recommended that sidewalks should always be included on both sides of a street. Soliere Avenue in Flagstaff, for example, is bordered on the north by Interstate 40. A decision was made to not build a sidewalk along that side because of the lack of destinations; however, there are still pedestrians who walk on that side of the street in the bike lane. In addition, bus stops have been added to that side of the road since the decision not to include sidewalks was made. In general, it is best to avoid trying to determine in advance where sidewalks are needed and where they are not.
- Parkways (a strip of land between the back of curb and the sidewalk) should be included wherever sidewalks are installed. Parkways provide a buffer for pedestrians from traffic, and in snow country provide a place for snow to be piled and for cinders to accumulate.
- There is a need to differentiate the need for sidewalks on state highways in remote rural areas, and state highways through communities and developed areas – the methodology to determine when sidewalks should be included will be very important.
- Sidewalks should be wider on streets with high volumes of traffic, where a parkway cannot be provided, and where there are vertical obstructions like walls, fences, buildings, and rock faces adjacent to the sidewalk.

Strategy 5

- Revising ARS to give bicyclists riding on a sidewalk or in a crosswalk the same rights and duties applicable to a pedestrian would significantly clarify the rights and duties of bicyclists.
- The proposed requirement for bicyclists to travel no faster than a speed appropriate for pedestrian travel, seems to be overly restrictive, would be

difficult to enforce, and would probably not be followed. In addition, there are circumstances where a bicyclist can safely travel at typical bicycle speeds rather than typical pedestrian speeds; for example long stretches of sidewalk with few street or driveway crossings and few pedestrians. The Oregon example only requires reduced speeds when a cyclist is approaching or entering a crosswalk, not in other areas.

- Revisions to ARS also need to address bicyclists' rights and duties on multi-use paths and not just sidewalks:
- The proposed revisions do not include multi-use pathways adjacent to the road (sidepaths), and therefore creates legal ambiguity for these facilities.
- Even when a multi-use path is on an independent alignment and not parallel or adjacent to a roadway, there will be instances where the path crosses a roadway, either at an intersection or a mid-block crossing. Because Subsection D exempts paths on independent alignments, the proposed revisions do not address the rights and duties of bicyclists who enter a crosswalk in these situations.
- Revising ARS to give bicyclists on a sidewalk or in a crosswalk the same rights and duties as pedestrians seems to be the most straightforward way to clarify proper bicycle operation because it extends the mutual yielding concept for drivers and pedestrians to bicyclists. Pedestrians may not suddenly leave the curb and walk or run into the path of a vehicle that is so close that it is impossible for the driver to yield; but once a pedestrian has safely entered the crosswalk, drivers of vehicles must yield the right-of-way to them. The same duties would require bicyclists riding on the sidewalk or a pathway to exercise due care before entering the crosswalk. Other approaches – requiring bicyclists to travel at or slow to the speed of pedestrians, or to dismount – are more difficult to enforce, run the risk of becoming overly restrictive, and in many cases would not be heeded.

Strategy 6

- Are there any opportunities to provide more useful information from pedestrian crashes?

Strategy 10

- Work with health organizations to encourage helmet use, particularly among children.
- Explore signing, pavement markings, publicity campaigns, and other ways to increase motorists awareness of bicyclists and pedestrians, particularly for turning vehicles at intersections.

Strategy 17

- State highways often create barriers in communities because traffic speeds and volumes can make them difficult to cross, and there are few places (signalized intersections) where pedestrians and bicyclists can cross comfortably. Medians and pedestrian crossing islands would clearly help, particularly in areas where generators and attractors are more dispersed and there are not obvious, well-used crossing points. One common problem with converting a two-way left turn lane (TWLTL) to a raised median is the number of driveways and side streets make it difficult to find stretches of the TWLTL that can be converted to raised median without affecting existing driveways. Many of the driveways are probably not necessary, but some access control is necessary to make it work.
- In Flagstaff, most signalized intersections along the state highway system have crossing prohibitions on one leg of the intersection, which discourages and unnecessarily inconveniences pedestrians. Additionally, on Route 66 (B40) through Flagstaff, bicyclists crossing Route 66 at a signal from the shared use path on the south side to a side street on the north side are already on the wrong side of the side street if they proceed north from the crossing. This seems to encourage wrong-way riding.

Strategy 18

- State highways often serve a “main street” function because there are numerous destinations along the road where people want to go, including bicyclists and pedestrians. As a result it is important to accommodate bicycles and pedestrians on these streets, or they will not have access to the places where they want to go. If parallel routes are provided, it should be in addition to facilities for bicycles and pedestrian on state highways, not in place of them.

Strategy 21

- Does ADOT have a policy to replace inductive loop detectors with video or infrared detectors, or to build new intersections with video or infrared detectors? If not, this may be an appropriate strategy as they can be more easily configured to detect bicycles

Strategy 24

- Bike lane stripes and symbols needs to be repainted/refreshed to ensure they are visible, particularly in snow country.
- Support the idea of adding a shoulder to Highway 89A between Flagstaff and Oak Creek Canyon.

IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Reports

An update of current and on-going bicycle-related projects was provided in the BAC packet. There were no questions or discussion on the Reports.

2. Concluding Announcements

There were no Concluding Announcements.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:02 pm.