



MINUTES

City of Flagstaff BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, June 2, 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 4:33 pm. On roll call, the following Committee members were present:

Steven Richard, chair
Dave Blanchard
Richard Hall
Jodi Norris
Jeff Stevenson
Jack Welch

Members absent:

None

One vacancy

The following City and agency staff was present:

Alicia Becker, NAIPTA
Blake Berner, Montoya fellow
Sara Dechter, long range planning manager
Martin Ince, multimodal transportation planner
David Wessel, FMPO manager

Public present:

Susan Hueftle
Matt Mitchell

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Announcements

Mr. Blanchard said that he still encounters cinders left on sidewalks after the winter.

Mr. Welch reported that Bike to Work Week was a success. He wondered what would make the cruiser ride more successful. It may work to keep it shorter and make it more of a family ride.

Mr. Ince introduced Blake Berner, who is the new Montoya fellow intern.

2. Public Comment

There was no Public Comment

3. Approval Of Minutes

Mr. Blanchard made, and Mr. Welch seconded, a motion to approve the minutes from the regular meeting of May 5, 2016 with one correction. The motion was approved unanimously (6-0).

II. OLD BUSINESS

1. Pedestrian and bicycle master plan

Mr. Ince presented a draft method for prioritizing missing bike lane projects. He outlined six factors, which include land use, level of bike use, functional class, volume of traffic, speed of traffic, and the number of bicycle crashes. Weighting scores of 1, 1.5, or 2 have been assigned to each factor. He asked the committee to review the factors and their weighting in regard to prioritizing missing bike lanes:

- There was a question about how representative Strava data is for commuter cyclists.
- Some bike routes may be important corridors, but may not be used heavily by cyclists because they are not comfortable.
- Land use should address future land use as well, to capture anticipated high growth areas.
- Is it possible to map "short cuts" to get a better handle on the work-arounds that cyclists use.
- The number of crashes should be given a weighting of 2 if safety is an important consideration. There was a brief discussion about the relationship between safety and the presence of bike lanes, especially at intersections.
- The results of the current survey that asks respondents to prioritize pedestrian and bicycle projects should be considered in the methodology.

- Intersection projects should be weighted higher than corridor or short segment projects, because more crashes occur at intersections and intersections are frequently where cyclists feel less comfortable.
- Cost should be considered as well.

Mr. Ince said that the prioritization methodology was step one, and that step two involves reviewing each potential project individually to apply other factors and circumstances that may not be captured in the methodology. In some cases bike lanes may not be possible without considerable expense; in these cases other facilities and solutions would be considered.

2. High occupancy housing plan

Ms. Dechter provided some background information on the High Occupancy Housing plan. She said the plan was directed by the City Council based on the recommendation of the student housing working group. She anticipates that the preparation of the plan will be a 12-15 month process, including extensive public outreach.

The process will include a steering committee that will assist with behind-the-scenes decisions when conflicts are encountered or impasses are reached. The steering committee will not make substantive decisions, but will help determine a course of action to pursue to resolve the conflict. She outlined the structure and process for the committee.

Ms. Dechter said she would like one steering committee member from either the BAC or PAC. After a brief discussion, Chair Richard indicated that he is interested in serving on the committee. Ms. Norris offered to serve as a back-up.

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. Regional Transportation Plan update

Mr. Wessel gave a short outline of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), including what it will include and what the public process will entail. He said the basic theme is to create a more-dense arterial network and a higher walking, biking, and transit share.

He described a bicycle level of service model that will be used in the plan, and went through the factors that make up the model. Bicycle level of service will be used in the plan in several ways:

- To help estimate bicycle demand in the region's traffic model
- To determine where the level of service for bikes should be raised

- As a negotiating point with developers to mitigate traffic impacts, and
- To help inform needed changes to development standards.

For funding sources, a major component will be the proposed extension of the transportation tax, which is set to expire in 2020. Mr. Wessel stressed that if nothing is done, congestion will get worse. He said it will be necessary to widen roads. The plan will consider intersection design that better accommodates bikes and pedestrians.

The committee had several questions and comments:

- Is there any information on the relationship between traffic levels and fluctuations in gas prices.
- What is meant by complete streets? The problem of Butler Avenue was brought up, where traffic volume and speed are too high to be comfortable for bicyclists, even when bike lanes are in place. The concept of a layered network was discussed, whereby a system of alternate routes to main streets is created.
- Small changes could help improve the network, for example improving alleys and easements for bicycle and pedestrian travel.

2. BAC appointments

Mr. Ince provided information on the current terms of committee members, and said there a few applicants that could be appointed at the August Transportation Commission meeting.

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 6:25 pm