

DRAFT MINUTES

City of Flagstaff BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE



Thursday, September 5, 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 4:32 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:

Martin Ince, Multimodal Transportation Planner
Christina Parry, Assistant City Attorney

Public present:

Jim Gibson
Joe Koenig
Terry White

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Announcements

Ms. Hueftle asked how comments from the Citizen Tracker on the City's web site are prioritized. She reported that she has submitted comments about the shared lane markings but has not heard anything back. She also asked about funding left from the 2000 transportation tax.

Mr. Goulden indicated that he want to make sure there is time in the agenda to discuss the bike share proposal process.

2. Public Comment

There was no Public Comment.

3. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Hueftle made, and Mr. Haughwout seconded, a motion to approve the minutes from the regular meeting of August 1, 2019. The motion was approved by a vote of 5-0-1 (one abstention).

II. OLD BUSINESS

1. Active transportation master plan/FUTS master plan

Mr. Ince presented detailed information regarding capital planning for sidewalks, bike lanes, FUTS trails, and crossings with funding from the 2020 transportation tax. He provided a brief demonstration of on-line maps to aid the planning process. At the next meeting, the Committee will discuss individual projects and work to finalize the 20-year program of projects.

2. E-bike amendments to City Code

Chair Haughwout summarized discussion from the August meeting, and suggested adding the votes of members who were not at the previous meeting to the straw poll from the August meeting.

All three members who were not at the August meeting voted against prohibiting e-bikes on the Arizona Trail (both paved and aggregate sections), the Nate Avery Trail, and any additional FUTS trails.

Additionally, Chair Haughwout changed his vote from prohibiting to allowing e-bikes on the Nate Avery Trail, and Ms. Hueftle changed her vote from considering to not considering additional FUTS trails for potential prohibitions.

Adding the new votes and the changed votes to the August straw poll produces the following results:

- Arizona Trail (paved): 7-0 to allow e-bikes
- Arizona Trail (aggregate): 4-3
- Nate Avery Trail: 4-3
- Other trails: 6-1

Mr. Gibson said he was not at the August meeting, but was dismayed to learn that the Committee had voted to restrict access on the FUTS to e-bikes. He does not think it makes sense to prohibit access on the Arizona Trail, or to chop-up trails into small sections. He said that he and his wife commute everywhere because of their

e-bikes. Now that he has more experience with e-bikes, he does not see a reason why they should not be on FUTS. He said that he probably rides slower now on an e-bike than he did on a regular bike when he was in his prime.

Ms. Hollander said she is concerned that it will not be productive if we have continual discussions as new devices are introduced. She wondered if there is an opportunity with Proposition 419 funding to provide better infrastructure to accommodate new devices and better mobility.

Mr. Ince asked the Committee to indicate their reasons for their votes to allow or prohibit e-bikes on FUTS trails. The following reasons were offered:

- There needs to be some rationale for why trails would be closed to e-bikes
- Allowing e-bikes provides consistency in the rules and enforcement, both across the FUTS system and statewide with Arizona Revised Statutes
- The City should think through what can be done to encourage more bicycle use
- Future design of multimodal facilities should accommodate a wider range of devices
- E-bikes are more accessible for people with mobility limitations.

III. NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business.

IV. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Reports

Gotcha bikeshare: The BAC had several comments about the proposal for bikeshare from Gotcha:

- Is there a potential enforcement problem if someone chooses the non-electric option but gets a ticket for riding someplace where e-bikes are not allowed
- Will the City consider "geofencing" areas to control speeds
- Would like the company to provide information about bike safety and courtesy
- There were specific questions and discussion about docking stations, the number of bikes, the length of the contract, and the electric versus pedal option.

The BAC expressed frustration with the RFP process and the fact that the BAC has not been included in any discussions regarding bikeshare or the selection process. The report to Council indicated that the BAC was part of the process, even though no presentations or discussions had been brought to the BAC. The BAC was consulted when Spin's trial contract was considered.

The Committee expressed its disappointment that their expertise was not considered in this process. It is disheartening to be unaware and read about City bicycle-related issues for the first time in the newspaper, and it makes it more difficult to volunteer time for the community.

In the future, the Committee would like to be make sure they are always included in bike-related issues for the City.

Mill Town: Mr. Ince said that Mill Town is moving forward with plans for University Avenue and Beulah Boulevard. He described planned pedestrian and bicycle facilities, including the pedestrian and bicycle underpass at Milton Road. He said that at-grade pedestrian crossings on Milton would be prohibited, which means that pedestrians will be forced to use the tunnel to get across Milton.

The Committee had several comments and questions about the tunnel:

- How will the trail will continue across the Target site, to the east towards University, and to the north along Riordan Ranch Street
- The tunnel needs a better quality of lighting that cannot be broken
- Can the tunnel be made feel safer and more inviting, for example with artwork, landscaping, and lighting
- What are the dimensions of the tunnel compared to existing underpasses
- If the tunnel is not usable, for example if it floods, how do pedestrians get across Milton?

The Committee also asked about the status of the Milton corridor study.

2. Concluding Announcements

There were no Concluding Announcements.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 pm