

DRAFT MINUTES

City of Flagstaff BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE



Thursday, March 7, 2019 | 4:30 pm

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

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:34 pm. On roll call, the following Committee members were present:

Mark Haughwout, chair
Daniel Crim
Jeff Goulden
Estella Hollander
Susan Hueftle
Matthew Mitchell

Members absent:

Kim Austin

The following City and agency staff was present:

Jason Blair, Flagstaff Police Department
Martin Ince, Multimodal Transportation Planner

Public present:

Barry Bertani
Joey Bono
Sasha Heinen
Tyler Linner
Anthony Quintile

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Announcements

Mr. Goulden said that he has some ideas for shared lane markings. He is concerned that drivers and some cyclists don't understand how they are supposed to work. He

suggested that we eliminate parking on one side of San Francisco Street to provide room for a bike lane.

Ms. Hueftle clarified that she is suggesting that red paint be used only at midblock crossings, not on every corner.

Mr. Haughwout reported that the Idaho stop law failed in Utah, but that the bicycle safety license plate is moving forward in Arizona.

2. Public Comment

There was no Public Comment.

3. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Hueftle made, and Mr. Crim seconded, a motion to approve the minutes from the regular meeting of February 7, 2019. The motion was approved unanimously (6-0).

II. OLD BUSINESS

1. E-bike and e-scooter amendments to City Code

Mr. Ince presented information about the proposed code amendments, including the results of the community survey and a summary of the proposed changes. He also presented a map that showed on which downtown streets bikes are not allowed.

The Committee noted that the prohibitions start where bike lanes end on Route 66 at the east end of downtown. There was a discussion about whether shared lane markings could be used, and what the speed limit is through that section. The Committee asked about the status of bike lanes on state routes 179 and 89A in Sedona, and if ADOT has assumed their maintenance.

The Committee made several observations:

- The comments about infrastructure bolsters the need for the Active Transportation Master Plan. It seems like the wider the surface, the fewer the conflicts.
- In San Diego scooters are not allowed on sidewalks, but the restrictions are ignored. That is likely what will happen here.
- It is easy to see why scooters are popular with tourists and students, but they are not "grocer-getters." The public doesn't seem to know where to put them.

City of Flagstaff - Bicycle Advisory Committee DRAFT Minutes

March 7, 2019 | Page 3 of 5

- If bike lanes were more complete and better maintained, scooters would feel safer using them and potential conflicts could be alleviated.
- The Committee wondered if future FUTS trails should be built wide enough to have a pedestrian side and a bike side.
- There was a question about including age restrictions for using scooters in the ordinance.
- Overall, the Committee did not find anything unexpected in the community survey.

Members of the public also made several comments:

- Ms. Bertani related an incident with a scooter on a sidewalk in Tempe. He advised the Committee to keep in simple, and not allow e-scooters or e-bikes on sidewalks.
- Ms. Heinen said that it is important to have facilities that are wide enough to accommodate bikes, scooters, and pedestrians.
- Mr. Quintile recommended keeping with ARS, otherwise there may be cross-jurisdictional issues. He believes the dogma against e-bikes in the cycling community will dissipate over time. In his experience at the bike shop, most mountain bike-style e-bikes are Class 1, while commuters are trending towards Class 3. Many are sold to older individuals who want to keep bicycling.
- Officer Blair said that scooters seem to be the biggest issue. Class 2 and 3 e-bikes will probably be an issue on sidewalks. He suggested a demo to get a better perspective on how they function.

The Committee then discussed and voted on whether each device should be allowed or prohibited on each facility type. The results of the voting are listed below:

Class 1 electric bikes

- Sidewalks: 4-2 (yes-no)
- Downtown sidewalks: 0-6
- FUTS trails: 5-1
- Bike lanes: 6-0

Class 2 electric bikes

- Sidewalks: 4-2
- Downtown sidewalks: 0-6
- FUTS trails: 5-1
- Bike lanes: 6-0

Class 3 electric bikes

- Sidewalks: 4-2
- Downtown sidewalks: 0-6
- FUTS trails: 5-1
- Bike lanes: 6-0

Electric stand-up scooters

- Sidewalks: 2-4
- Downtown sidewalks: 0-6
- FUTS trails: 5-1
- Bike lanes: 5-1

The Committee reviewed the proposed ordinance language and had a number of comments:

- A suggestion was made to include a more general definition of micro-mobility devices. This could cover future devices that are currently not defined or regulated. For example, some companies are already offering a sit-down version of the scooter, which would not be covered under the current code amendments. The definitions could be based on maximum speed, weight, and width.
- The Committee recommended removing skateboards from the mandatory helmet law for children under 18.
- The Committee recommended removing the requirement to provide a truthful name and date-of-birth. There is already a provision in ARS that indicates an officer can only ask for a name, and disallows other questions.
- Officer Blair confirmed that there is not a law against "bicycling under the influence" in Arizona. The committee recommended by a 6-0 straw poll to eliminate the section on operating electric bike and scooters while under the influence.
- The Committee discussed the service provider and impoundment sections, and expressed a concern that the current wording would prevent local bike shops and other companies from offering rental bike devices. They recommended changes to the code amendments that do not preclude more traditional rental of bicycles and other devices

2. Active transportation master plan/FUTS master plan

Mr. Ince reported that presentations have been made to the City Council, Planning and Zoning Commission, and Transportation Commission. He also reference a recent article in the Arizona Daily Sun. The Committee asked to be made aware of

the schedule for future presentations, to provide an opportunity for the Committee to express its support.

III. NEW BUSINESS

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 6:37 pm