



MINUTES

City of Flagstaff BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, March 2, 2017 | 4:30 pm

Flagstaff City Hall, Council Chambers
211 West Aspen Avenue, Flagstaff, Arizona

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:32 pm. On roll call, the following Committee members were present:

Jeff Stevenson, acting chair
Kim Austin
Mark Haughwout
Susan Hueftle
Matthew Mitchell
Margaret Penado (arrived late)

Members absent:

Melanie Street

One vacancy

The following City and agency staff was present:

Martin Ince, multimodal transportation planner
David Wessel, FMPO manager

Public present:

Tyler Linner
Jack Welch
Denise Wynne

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Announcements

Ms. Austin introduced herself as a new member of the Bicycle Advisory Committee. She has previously served on the City's Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

Mr. Haughwout pointed out that the City's Bicycle Friendly Community report card mentioned keeping bike lanes free of cinders; but we do not do a very good job.

2. Public Comment

There was no Public Comment

3. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Haughwout made, and Ms. Hueftle seconded, a motion to approve the minutes from the regular meeting of February 2, 2012. The motion was approved unanimously (5-0).

II. OLD BUSINESS

1. Active transportation master plan

The Committee continued its discussion of the Active Transportation Master Plan.

Mr. Ince reported that a more detail review has been done regarding accommodation of bike lanes where they are missing. One of the outcomes of this review is that it appears that a shoulder will not fit on the section of Route 66 between Phoenix and Humphreys, where the street curves under the railroad underpass. The Committee discussed access to downtown from the south and potential solutions. None of the potential solutions are easy to accomplish in the short term, although the problem with access exists now.

The section of Country Club between Oakmont and Bear Paw should be reclassified as a short-term project.

The Committee discussed bike safety in roundabouts.

A question was asked if an interim solution for Izabel Street (near the high school and rec center) can be implemented in advance of a bike boulevard, for example bike lanes or shared lane markings.

Mr. Ince introduced information and analysis of several different types of bicycle facilities, including at-grade and grade-separated crossings, buffered and protected bike lanes, and a bikeway through the mall area that would serve as an alternate to Highway 89. He said there is not time to discuss the information at this meeting, but he asked the Committee to review the information for discussion at the next meeting.

The Committee said that it would be beneficial for the Council to see the City's Bicycle Friendly Community report card, and asked if a presentation to them could be scheduled.

The Committee discussed options for revival of the community's Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program. Lack of a program affects our ability to achieve gold status. The grant program for SRTS may be brought back by the state in the next few years. There is a potential to ask for programmatic funding for SRTS as part of the

renewal of the Transportation Tax. How much is necessary to fund a reasonable program, and what program elements were lost when grant funding was lost. Can volunteers help take up some of the slack.

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. Regional Transportation Plan Blueprint 2040

Mr. Wessel, manager of the FMPO, made a presentation regarding the draft Regional Transportation Plan.

He said the plan is currently in the public comment period, and that he is going to a variety of boards and commissions to make a similar presentation.

The plan, which must be updated every five years, helps guide the region's investments in transportation infrastructure. The policy framework for the plan relates back to the Regional Plan 2030. There is an emphasis on congestion management, safety, and multi-modal options.

Mr. Wessel briefly explained the scoring system used to prioritize potential transportation infrastructure projects. Proposed projects in the plan include

- Widening both interstates to 3 lanes in each direction
- Widening most major arterials to 4 lanes
- Widening Milton Road, and parts of Route 66, to 6 lanes
- Extension of J.W. Powell Boulevard, Woody Mountain Road, and Switzer Canyon Rd

Potential bypasses for US89 and US180 are not included as proposed projects. ADOT is initiating a study for both Milton Road and US180.

The plan considers more high-frequency service for transit. Transit may be a part of the solution to congestion, since it can be a high-capacity carrier, and it is difficult and expensive to build new roads.

For pedestrians and bikes, the plan aims to close gaps in the system and address connectivity standards.

The plan anticipates about \$280 million in funding over the next 20 years, coming mainly from the renewal of the City's transportation tax, which is set to expire in 2020. Other funding sources include the County and ADOT, the transit tax, and transit grants.

Not all of the proposed projects in the plan can be funded; but the projects recommended for funding include widening Milton Road, widening Lone Tree Road,

widening Butler Avenue, extension of J.W. Powell, widening of Fourth Street, and construction of a new bridge over Fourth Street.

Bicycle and pedestrian projects have been modeled, and the results indicate that these projects collectively can have a significant impact on congestion relief. The plan recommends about \$20 million for sidewalks and crossings, although this amount could be reallocated to other types of pedestrian and bicycle projects depending on the outcome of the Active Transportation Master Plan.

The Committee asked a number of questions:

- A question was asked about the process for the transportation tax. Mr. Wessel said that the tax is approved by the voters, but that the City Council will determine the questions that go to the voters. Usually the Council convenes a citizens committee to review and recommend the contents of the ballot question.
- What is the status of the Lone Tree overpass? The estimate for the overpass is about \$65 million, which would be entirely funded by the City with no assistance from developers or partners. This was thought to take up too much of the available revenues.
- What is the difference between high-frequently transit and bus rapid transit (BRT)? BRT usually includes a number of other features.
- Do vehicle miles traveled and vehicle hours traveled account for the anticipated growth in student population? Expanding neighborhoods typically mean that people live further from their jobs. Much of our recent growth has been close-in, but future growth will likely be further out.
- How are funding levels for bike and pedestrian projects determined? Ultimate funding amounts for bike and ped projects will be recommended by the City Council and determined by the voters. Some of the street projects will be complete streets projects, meaning that sidewalks and bike lanes will be included.
- Where is Flagstaff on transit ridership, and how much room is there for improvement?
- Can enhanced facilities for bicycling, like bike lockers, be included in future transit stop?

The online comment period for the plan runs through March 28. Mr. Wessel directed the Committee to the online comment form.

2. Election of officers

Mr. Stevenson made, and Ms. Hueftle seconded, a motion to elect Mark Haughwout as chair of the Bicycle Advisory Committee. The motion was approved unanimously (6-0).

Ms. Penado made, and Mr. Haughwout seconded, a motion to elect Susan Hueftle as vice-chair of the Bicycle Advisory Committee. The motion was approved unanimously (6-0).

IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Reports

There was no discussion on the Reports

2. Concluding Announcements

There were no Concluding Announcements

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 pm