

DRAFT MINUTES

City of Flagstaff BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE



Thursday, April 1, 2021 | 4:30 pm

Virtual meeting via Microsoft Teams

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:35 pm. On roll call, the following Committee members were present:

Kim Austin
Daniel Crim
Jeff Goulden
Estella Hollander
Susan Hueftle, vice-chair

Members absent:

Mark Haughwout, chair
Matthew Mitchell

The following City and agency staff were present:

Ramon Alatorre, Sustainability Program
Rick Barrett, City engineer
Jeff Bauman, traffic engineering manager
Charles Hernandez, Flagstaff Police Department
Martin Ince, multimodal transportation planner
Jim McCarthy, Council liaison
Adam Shimoni, Council member
Adam Williams, Police Department liaison

Public present:

Lauren Chavez-Pardini
Lily (last name unknown)
Joe Koenig
Greg Mace
Savannah (last name unknown)

I. PRELIMINARY GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Announcements

Ms. Hueftle asked if the FUTS and bikeways map will be reprinted soon. Mr. Ince said there were only a few boxes left and that a new map would be needed in a few months.

Ms. Hueftle asked about the status of bikeshare, and suggested reaching out to Cosmic Cycles for their previous experience.

Ms. Hueftle asked when City commissions could meet again in person. Mr. Ince said that a date has not been set.

Ms. Hueftle asked if there was any new information regarding the bicycle fatality. Officer Williams responded that it is still under investigation.

Councilmembers McCarthy and Shimoni introduced themselves.

2. Public Comment

There was no Public Comment.

3. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Hollander made, and Ms. Hueftle seconded, a motion to approve the minutes of the rescheduled meeting of March 17, 2021. The motion was approved unanimously (5-0).

Mr. Goulden made, and Ms. Hueftle seconded, a motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of February 4, 2021. The motion was approved unanimously (5-0).

Ms. Hueftle made, and Mr. Goulden seconded, a motion to approve the minutes of the joint PAC-BAC meeting of January 14, 2021. The motion was approved unanimously (5-0).

II. OLD BUSINESS

1. Active transportation master plan

Mr. Ince provided information about the how FUTS trails function as bikeways and incorporated into the bikeways plan. He said that the City's historic pattern is to include bike lanes on busy streets, and in many cases a FUTS trail alongside for cyclists who are not comfortable in the street. However, this is not always a good arrangement. He said the intent of the bikeways plan is to provide comfortable accommodation on or along the street for a wide variety of cyclists. This allows the FUTS to serve as a separate system away from the street. It also provides an opportunity to reconsider where FUTS have been planned

along future streets, to determine if it is better to provide separated or protected bike lanes. He asked the Committee to consider a handful of streets where FUTS either exist or are planned.

There were several preliminary comments and questions:

- Will the FUTS still be available for bicyclists? Yes.
- Will bicyclists still be allowed to use the street? Yes.
- Education will be needed for whatever type of facility is provided.
- Does the selection process account for the presence of side streets and driveways? Yes.
- Are there any legal implications for facilities that are off-street? Unknown at this time, but further research can be done.

Route 66

- The existing FUTS is a well-used facility
- Connectivity to north side should be improved for bicyclists, including adding missing crossings at existing traffic signals, and exploring opportunities for additional crossings

Fort Valley Road

- Bike lanes will remain on street
- Existing FUTS will be the main bikeway facility
- A reflective stripe along trail would help for nighttime use, especially where headlights shine on trail

Lone Tree Road (south)

- The existing trail is not preferred facility for many road cyclists
- Trail has developed numerous surface cracks
- Lighting would be helpful where the trail veers away from street
- Future on-street facilities will depend on speed and volume of future street, and if traffic will be diverted away by new Lone Tree alignment
- How will we decide on what type of facility is needed? The bikeways plan will provide guidance based on the speed and volume of the street, and the class of bikeway

- At a minimum, buffered bike lanes should be used

Fourth Street

- Discussion is only for the portion south of Route 66, as there are few options for enhanced facilities north of Route 66 due to space constraints
- Existing FUTS is near complete and will be main bikeway facility
- Buffered bike lanes are planned for on-street

Country Club Drive

- Shoulder on southbound side is not very wide or marked as a bike lane
- There is less traffic south of Old Walnut Canyon Rd
- Can we narrow vehicle lanes to make wider bike lanes
- The plans call for replacement of the existing narrow trail on the east side with a cycletrack and sidewalk from Cortland to Old Walnut Canyon
- There is a benefit to keeping a southbound bike lane

Highway 89

- USFS has plans to extend the trail from Snowflake to the Sandy Seep trailhead
- A crossing is needed at Snowflake. There was a brief discussion about the difference between a rectangular rapid flashing beacon and a pedestrian hybrid beacon
- The existing FUTS will be the main bikeway from Snowflake to Marketplace
- There are some options for getting through the mall area on the north/west side of Highway 89

Pulliam Drive

- Reflective stripes needed along trail

Lone Tree Road (north)

- It is important to keep FUTS connection between Route 66 and Sinclair Wash FUTS
- Northbound bike lane would allow better access to east side

- Buttonhook connections are needed between facilities along Lone Tree and Route 66 FUTA
- A pedestrian and bicycle crossing is needed at Franklin or Sawmill

Remaining streets will be discussed at the April meeting, including Milton Road and the University/Beulah realignment.

III. **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no New Business.

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 5:58 pm