



MINUTES

City of Flagstaff BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, July 7, 2016 | 4:30 pm

Flagstaff City Hall, Council Chambers
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:

Steven Richard, chair
Dave Blanchard
Richard Hall
Jack Welch

Members absent:

Jodi Norris
Jeff Stevenson

One vacancy

The following City and agency staff was present:

Andrew Hoffman, Police Department
Martin Ince, multimodal transportation planner

Public present:

Sean Hanberg
Matt Mitchell

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Announcements

There were no Announcements

2. Public Comment

There was no Public Comment

3. Approval Of Minutes

Mr. Welch made, and Mr. Hall; seconded, a motion to approve the minutes from the regular meeting of June 2, 2016. The motion was approved unanimously (4-0).

II. OLD BUSINESS

1. Pedestrian and bicycle master plan

Mr. Ince presented results from the pedestrian and bicycle survey. The survey ended on June 19, 2016 and garnered 294 responses. Results help indicate the public's priority for a variety of specific walking and biking projects.

Milton Road was rated highly in several questions, including bike lanes, overpasses and underpasses, pedestrian-bike crossings, and complete streets. Mr. Ince said that Milton consistently receives the most attention in public surveys that ask where better pedestrian and bicycle facilities are needed. He offered several possible reasons why this is the case:

- Milton Road is very centrally located within Flagstaff's overall pedestrian and bicycle networks, so many walkers and bikers have to use it or cross it to travel across town.
- Milton Road includes a lot of destinations that attract pedestrians and bicyclists
- To most observers, Milton Road has a very poor environment for walking and biking, so it receives attention in surveys.

The Committee offered a number of thoughts on Milton Road:

- It may be difficult to make Milton Road appealing to many bicyclists, but the attention it receives in surveys indicates that the walking and cycling environment must be addressed.
- If bike lanes were added to Milton, many, but not all, cyclists would use them.
- There are many destinations along the corridor. Bike facilities on Milton would provide the most direct access to them for cyclists.
- Milton would be an expensive project, so should consideration be given to using the money to implement a variety of smaller projects.
- There was a discussion about how many cyclists would use Milton if it included bike lanes. It was noted that road cyclists use the shoulder on Route 66, even though there is a FUTS along one side.

City of Flagstaff - Bicycle Advisory Committee Minutes

July 7, 2016 | Page 3 of 4

- An overpass would be an important component of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure along Milton.
- It would be useful to conduct a survey just for Milton Road to gain a better understanding of the issues and the appropriate solutions.
- Milton needs to be addressed for better pedestrian and bicycle accommodation. The longer it is put off, the more expensive it becomes.

The Committee also discussed a number of other points regarding the results of the survey:

- Additional surveys would be helpful as planning moves forward. The surveys should provide specific potential solutions and options for people to react to.
- The Committee discussed pedestrian and bicycle safety on the NAU campus. Even though the students are in the highest demographic for bicycle crashes, there appears to be few crashes on campus. Streets on campus tend to be narrow and have slower traffic, which make them safer as roadways even if capacity may be diminished.
- The planned widening of Lone Tree Road may not be popular with the neighborhoods along the corridor. Lone Tree Road scored fairly high in the question about bike lanes, but it may be a much different roadway in the future.
- Country Club and Highway 89 did not score high in the bike lane question, possibly because they are further from the city's core and serve smaller areas.
- The Santa Fe FUTS trail received the most votes for FUTS trails, but its construction relies entirely on the Rio de Flag flood control project. The Committee wondered if recent flooding events have affected the urgency of the flood control project.
- The Rio de Flag underpass is probably too far out of the way, and not in a future growth area, to receive much attention.
- There is a need for an underpass somewhere between Fourth Street and Country Club. Since it would help workers in the industrial area, would businesses be willing to participate in funding.
- Where center islands are used for traffic calming, there is a tendency for motorists to swerve over into the bike lane to avoid having to slow down. This seems to be a regular problem at the new island on Lone Tree.
- Are there any statistics on use and safety at the new pedestrian crossings on Fourth Street? Observation indicates that motorists will slow, but not stop for

pedestrians. The meaning of flashing yellow lights may not be clear to all drivers. There is a need for automatic detection of pedestrians in the middle island, so it is not necessary to press the button again.

- It may be possible to determine the priority of other bicycle projects not included in the survey based on proximity and similarity to projects that were included in the survey.
- There may be additional residents in Country Club who are interested in commuting, but who are intimidated because of the lack of good facilities. It would be useful to conduct a survey of residents in the area, for example at Foxglenn Park.
- There was a discussion about point A to point B travel versus access to local destinations.

2. BAC appointments

Mr. Ince reported that several individuals are interested in submitting applications to serve on the BAC. He said that appointments would likely be made at the August Transportation Commission meeting.

III. NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business

IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Reports

There were no Reports

2. Concluding Announcements

There were no Concluding Announcements

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:11 pm