



MINUTES

City of Flagstaff BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, April 6, 2017 | 4:30 pm

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

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:36 pm. On roll call, the following Committee members were present:

Mark Haughwout, chair
Kim Austin
Susan Hueftle
Matthew Mitchell
Jeff Stevenson
Melanie Street

Members absent:

Margaret Penado

The following City and agency staff was present:

Andrew Hoffman, Flagstaff Police Department
Martin Ince, multimodal transportation planner

Public present:

Tyler Linner
Denise Wynne

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Announcements

Ms. Hueftle expressed a concern that shared lane markings have worn out.

Mr. Mitchell asked if a discussion about jersey barriers on the Fourth Street bridges could be placed on the next agenda.

Chair Haughwout mentioned an issue with the placement of "Bike lane closed" signs. When there is no bike lane, bicyclists are pushed out further into the street by the signs.

Mr. Stevenson announced that he is moving to Payson, and this will be his last meeting.

2. Public Comment

There was no Public Comment

3. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Hueftle made, and Ms. Austin seconded, a motion to approve the minutes from the regular meeting of March 2, 2012. The motion was approved unanimously (6-0).

II. OLD BUSINESS

1. Active transportation master plan

Mr. Ince presented information on protected bike lanes. He referenced four different levels of protection; buffered bike lanes, protected bike lanes, cycletracks, and FUTS trails. Potential candidate streets have volumes of 15,000 ADT or greater, a posted speed limit of 30 mph or higher, and four or more lanes of traffic. The Committee reviewed 12 candidate street corridors regarding the potential to add protected bike lanes.

The Committee made several comments and asked several questions during the course of discussion:

- Interactions with bus stops and pull-outs must be managed as part of the design of protected or buffered bike lanes.
- Maintenance, snow removal, and sweeping will be significant concerns. If the bike lane is buffered by striping only, it can still be swept, resurfaced, and plowed in conjunction with the adjoining street. However, this does not occur even with normal bike lanes. If there is a physical barrier in place, the bike lane must be maintained separately from the street. There is a concern regarding whether this would be done. FUTS trails, on the other hand, are plowed, swept, and maintained separately from the street.
- Installation of a demonstration project is recommended.
- There was a discussion about perceived safety benefits versus actual safety benefits, especially between buffered and protected bike lanes.
- The Committee wondered how wide the buffer must be before it provided a level of comfort for cyclists.
- FUTS trails have some issues for cyclists, but they are the most comfortable facility.

- Differences in color, contrast, and texture in the buffer would help, even when the buffer is narrow. Rumble strips were mentioned as an option to help provide separation.

Options for Country Club Drive were discussed. This is generally an inhospitable area for bicyclists. A FUTS would be more comfortable than bike lanes through this area. The section of FUTS over I-40 tends to fill up with trash in the space between the two barriers. There is a need to connect a FUTS back into the neighborhood to improve access for walking and biking. One of the underpasses along Soliere would help with connectivity. Soliere would be a good candidate for a cycletrack.

Some additional information about protected bike lanes, including experience in other communities, is needed to further the discussion.

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. SB1273 Electric Bicycles

Mr. Ince presented information on SB1273, which defines and regulates electric bicycles and is working its way through the Arizona legislature.

Officer Hoffman said that PD does not do much in the way of enforcement on FUTS trails, and that typically not much is needed. He said that he did not have knowledge of electric bikes that were involved in crashes, and that there have been no complaints about them from other FUTS users. He can check to see if it is possible for the PD to begin tracking crashes.

The Committee discussed how speeds and restrictions on electric bike could be enforced on the FUTS. Does enforcement result in a de facto speed limit for electric bikes at 20 mph, or will officers examine the required sticker? Officer Hoffman thought that in either case it would be a challenge for enforcement.

There would be some benefit in adopting a local ordinance; enforcement will be easier, and it will be possible to educate the public and make our rules regarding electric bikes clear and available for everyone.

The Committee asked about the effective date of the ordinance, and discussed whether it would be possible to take a wait-and-see approach. There was a general feeling that it would be better to time new regulations to coincide with state legislation, rather than trying to put something in place afterwards.

The Committee discussed what would be reasonable for FUTS trails and what should be restricted, and reached the following points of consensus:

- Gas-powered motors should not be allowed on FUTS
- Class 1 and 2 electric bikes, which have a maximum speed of 20 mph, are probably okay on FUTS trails

- Class 3, which have a maximum speed of 28 mph, are probably too fast for FUTS trails
- There may be a good reason to think of aggregate trails differently than paved trails, because higher speeds may result in more problems.

The Committee asked to continue the discussion at the next meeting, but asked for additional information regarding what other jurisdictions are doing.

IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Reports

There was no discussion on the Reports

2. Concluding Announcements

The Committee asked if Bike-to-Work Week could be discussed at the next meeting.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:21 pm