

DRAFT MINUTES

City of Flagstaff BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE



Thursday, July 5, 2018 | 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 4:32 pm. On roll call, the following Committee members were present:

Mark Haughwout, chair
Jeff Goulden
Estella Hollander
Matthew Mitchell

Members absent:

Kim Austin
Susan Hueftle
Margaret Penado

The following City and agency staff was present:

Paige Hardman, Montoya Fellow intern
Martin Ince, Multimodal Transportation Planner

Public present:

Darren Bingham
Tyler Linner

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Announcements

Ms. Hollander briefly introduced the MoveMeFLG website, and offered to make a formal presentation at the August meeting.

Chair Haughwout reported that the Cedar Trail intersection crossing at Pine Cliff Drive is dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists. There is poor visibility due to the

grades and landscaping, which makes it difficult for anyone crossing to see cars making the turn.

2. Public Comment

Mr. Linner said that a better trail connection is needed from the Rio Home neighborhood down to the Sinclair Wash FUTS.

3. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Mitchell made, and Mr. Goulden seconded, a motion to approve the minutes from the regular meeting of June 7, 2018. The motion was approved unanimously (4-0).

II. OLD BUSINESS

1. Active Transportation Master Plan

Mr. Ince presented a revised version of the interactive FUTS map. There were a number of comments from the BAC:

- Pages seem to load fairly slow. Mr. Ince said that the City Hall wi-fi is not always fast, and that there is a lot of information that need to load initially when the map is started.
- The interactive map should be incorporated into the overall FUTS web page, to avoid duplicated information.
- There was a discussion about when the page would be made available to the public. The public should be able to submit location-based comments. At a minimum, a simple thumbs-up/thumbs-down function would be helpful.
- It would also be useful to have a static PDF map available to review.
- The use of jargon should be avoided, and if necessary provide a glossary.
- Is there a term for accessible that does not have ADA connotations, for example "accessible-for-all" or "usable-by-all"
- The quality of being intuitive also means that a trail is easy to use.

2. People for Bikes grant application

Mr. Ince asked the Committee to consider what factors and streets would make a good pilot project for protected bike lanes, and whether it would be better to treat

an entire corridor to give cyclists a full experience, or treat a part of a corridor to provide a sample.

Factors that would make a good demonstration street include the speed of vehicles and the speed of cyclists (uphill or downhill sections).

There may be several locations where contra-flow lanes would work. For example along the driveway to Christensen School. South Beaver and San Francisco would also be good candidates, especially in the one-block section between Route 66 and Phoenix Avenue.

There are a number of drainage grates along Fourth Street that extend into the bike lane. Adding a barrier for protection would create a pinch point at these locations.

Another consideration could be streets or areas where there is limited bicycle infrastructure.

3. Police Department bicycle safety campaign

The Committee discussed the enforcement of coming to a complete stop at stop signs, and how to have a consistent enforcement policy for the police. One option is to avoid attempting to define a complete stop, and instead focus on whether the cyclist was mindful of and yielded to cross traffic. This essentially creates an Idaho-stop situation, where cyclists are allowed to treat stop signs as yield signs. Not all Committee members were comfortable with this idea.

The Committee also discussed the use of yield and stop signs where FUTS trails cross streets. Mr. Ince explained that the decision to place stop, yield, or no signs at street crossings is based on the traffic control, traffic speed and traffic volume of the cross street. If there is existing traffic control on the cross street or at an intersection – including traffic signals and stop or yield signs, then the trail will have the same control.

In other cases, the decision is based on whether it would likely be necessary for a cyclist to stop or yield to cross traffic in order to cross safely. For example, on fast-moving, high-volume streets, it will be likely that a cyclist would have to come to a complete stop before they can cross safely. In these situations, a stop sign would be used. On lower-speed/lower-volume streets, the cyclist may have to pause for a moment before they can cross the street safely. In these locations a yield sign would be used.

Mr. Ince said that in the past stop signs are typically used at all crossings, whether they were needed or not. The overuse of stop signs at trail crossings can encourage cyclists to disregard them. He said that using a systematic and rational approach to stop and yield signs along the trail is intended to foster better compliance and ultimately make cyclists and pedestrians more safe.

The Committee determined to have Officer Blair present for future discussions regarding enforcement.

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. Flagstaff Bicycle Friendly Community renewal application

A copy of the blank BFC renewal application was included in the BAC's packet. Mr. Ince said that the application is due on August 9. Flagstaff has been a BFC since 2006, and our last application was submitted in 2014. Mr. Ince said he would include a draft of the renewal application in the packet for the August meeting.

IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Reports

- Spin bike share: a link to ridership numbers for June was presented.
- BAC terms and reappointments: reappointments will be made at the August 1 Transportation Commission meeting. Ms. Penado has resigned the Committee, creating one vacancy
- Transportation Sales Tax: a presentation will be made to the Committee about the tax proposal at the September or October meeting.

2. Concluding Announcements

There were no Concluding Announcements.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:35 pm