

DRAFT MINUTES

City of Flagstaff BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE



Thursday, December 6, 2018 | 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:

Mark Haughwout, chair
Kim Austin
Jeff Goulden
Estella Hollander
Susan Hueftle
Matthew Mitchell

Members absent:

None

One vacancy

The following City and agency staff was present:

Nicole Antonopoulos, Sustainability Manager
Jason Blair, Flagstaff Police Department
Martin Ince, Multimodal Transportation Planner
Julie Leid, Transportation Commission
Christina Parry, City Attorney's Office

Public present:

Darren Bingham
Joey Bono
Lauren Chavez-Pardini
Daniel Crim
Tyler Linner

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Announcements

Mr. Ince said that Mr. Crim's appointment to the Bicycle Advisory Committee had been delayed because the Transportation Commission meeting on the previous evening had been cancelled due to a lack of quorum. He said that the Transportation Commission's next meeting is scheduled for February, at which time the appointment will be made.

Mr. Crim introduced himself to the Committee and described his interest in cycling as transportation.

Ms. Hueftle said that tall buildings were creating ice build-up on streets. She also expressed frustration that the Committee was not more proactive in advocating for additional funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects in Proposition 419. The current road-oriented funding balance is not compatible with a sustainable community. Ms. Leid responded that the funding for pedestrian and bicycle projects will be \$29 million over 20 years, which represents an increase over the previous tax, which provided \$20 million over 20 years. She also said that the street projects will be complete streets.

Ms. Hueftle asked if a headlamp is sufficient as a bike light on the front, and whether a blinky light was sufficient on the rear in place of a reflector. She reported that a number of individuals had complained to her that they were given tickets for riding their bicycle with improper gear, even though they wore a headlamp and had a blinky light on the back. She also said that all of those stopped were people of color, and wondered about the Police Department's policies and training. Officer Blair responded that a front light must be affixed to the bike, and that there may be other factors in the stops.

2. Public Comment

There was no Public Comment.

3. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Goulden made, and Mr. Mitchell seconded, a motion to approve the minutes from the regular meeting of October 4, 2018. The motion was approved unanimously (6-0).

II. OLD BUSINESS

1. Active Transportation Master Plan

This item was not discussed

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. Bike share, e-bike legislation, and shared/micromobility devices

Ms. Antonopoulos presented information on the results of the six-month pilot program with Spin bikes, which ended in October. She showed some maps and charts that summarize usage patterns, and provided some results from a community survey. She said she feels good about the results. There was some concern about bicycle parking, but overall there is strong support for bike share.

She reported that the City is working on a Request for Proposals (RFP) for bike share providers to extend the program. NAU will be part of the proposal. The program will likely be a hybrid approach of both docked and dockless, for example there may be dedicated bike corrals downtown and on campus where bike share bikes will be available.

She said that she wants the community to be involved in how the program is structured, and she wants the program to do more to promote equity. City staff is currently reviewing recent programs and legislation in other communities.

She said that many dockless bike share companies offer electric scooters as part of their fleet, and there is a possibility that e-bikes could make up as much as 10-20 percent of the fleet. She said that the City's first priority will be bicycles, but the City should be prepared for scooters.

Mr. Ince provided information on the legal status and regulation of e-bikes and other electric mobility devices. He said that the Arizona Revised Statutes already provides guidance for e-bikes at the state level, but the state gives the City some discretion to regulate them on FUTS trails. He outlined a series of questions for discussion regarding scooters and e-bikes, and asked the Committee to consider how public engagement should be included.

The Committee had a number of comments and questions:

- There was a question about why Spin reduced the number of available bikes towards the end of the pilot period. Ms. Antonopoulos said that Spin's overall business model was more focused on scooters, and less on bicycles, by the end of the pilot program. There appears to be a correlation between the number of bikes that were available and the number of rides.
- The Committee asked about the concerns for scooters. Ms. Antonopoulos said there are concerns about how fast they go, whether they are safe, if they should be operated on sidewalks with pedestrians, and where they are stored when not in use. Ms. Parry said they are reviewing scooter legislation in other communities, and are considering changes to the City Code to regulate them.

- The Committee wondered if Spin bike usage resulted in an increase in sidewalk riding. The Police Department did not have any data, and there was little in the way of anecdotal evidence.
- The Committee asked about the financial arrangement with Spin, and if the company did not make enough from bikes alone.
- The Committee discussed how scooters might be regulated, and what might be included in the legislation.
- Distribution of bike share bikes around the community might be accomplished by paying community members to redeploy bicycles. City staff is looking into including this concept in the RFP.
- How reliable were the bike share bikes, and do we have any information on attrition and failure rates?
- What is the level of satisfaction with e-scooters in other communities? Have there been any instances where a community has started a scooter program, but then eliminated it?
- There was a discussion about the legal definitional of sidewalks versus pathways. Sidewalks are defined in ARS, but pathways are not. Both sidewalks and pathways are defined in City Code.
- NAU's bicycle information on their website encourages bike on pathways, and not on streets.
- The Committee discussed speeds and e-bikes. Many cyclists are able to go 20 mph, although they tend not to be novice riders. Have we considered speed limits on FUTS trails? Higher speeds would be more problematic on curvy, aggregate trails. In terms of speeds there does not seem to be much difference between pedal-assist and throttle.
- Bells are a very useful tool when passing pedestrians or slower bicyclists on trails. City Code requires an audible signal when overtaking pedestrians on a FUTS trail.
- The City needs to hear from the public as part of this process.
- Scooters could be given the same rights and duties as bicyclists.
- There was a discussion about how scooter programs operate. Typically, an operator must have a drivers license to rent a scooter, so anyone under age 16 is eliminated. There was a question about the wattage of the electric motors. For scooter users it is more difficult and not as fun to be on a crowded sidewalk.

- There was a question about whether Class 3 e-bikes are allowed in bike lanes, and how pathways are defined.
- Since ARS has already addressed e-bikes, are there limits to the City's authority to further regulate them? Can we be more restrictive than ARS?
- New trends in mobility technology means there will be more competition for space in the pedestrian and bicycle realm, which is already limited. One solution is to create more space for walking and biking and new mobility devices.

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 6:32 pm