



August 27, 2018

## BICYCLE TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM
2. Individuals present included the following:
  - Caroline Michael, City of Longmont (COL) Traffic Engineering
  - Chad Stearman, Bicycle Task Force Member (Task Force)
  - Chris Salt, Task Force
  - Christina Edstrom, Livewell Longmont
  - Devin Quince, Task Force
  - Heidi Quince, Task Force
  - Phil Greenwald, COL Transportation Planner
  - Tyler Stamey, COL Traffic Engineering, and
  - Ben Ortiz, COL Planner
3. The June 25, 2018 meeting minutes were approved as presented.
4. Christina Edstrom presented highlights of the Enhanced Multi Use Corridor Livewell Survey findings. Most notably, she stated 91 percent of the survey respondents indicated that they either walk only for transportation and/or recreation-related purposes, bike only for transportation and/or recreation-related purposes, or both bike and walk for transportation and/or recreational purposes. Christina also discussed the responses to what would make one feel safer riding a bicycle in Longmont. Sixty four percent noted that facilities completely separated from cars on a sidewalk or side path and 47 percent said that being separated from cars with some type of physical barrier (e.g. a protected bike lane) would make them feel safer riding a bicycle in Longmont. Discussion ensued about new facilities as well as the existing trial project.
5. Following up on the request of the Task Force, Ben Ortiz provided a summary of Senate Bill 18-144 (SB144). The provisions of the legislation includes the following:
  - a. SB144 allows municipalities to adopt local ordinances regulating the operation of bicycles approaching intersections with stop signs or illuminated red traffic control signals.
  - b. SB144 allows municipalities to pass an ordinance allowing bicyclists approaching a stop

sign to slow to a reasonable speed, and if required for safety, stop before entering the intersection. If a stop is not required for safety, the person riding a bicycle can proceed through the intersection when it's safe to do so without stopping. The bill sets the reasonable speed limit at 15 miles per hour.

- c. Municipalities can lower the reasonable speed to a maximum of 10 mph or raise the limit to no more than 20 mph at any individual intersection if the municipality also posts signs at the intersection stating the lower or higher speed limit.
- d. SB144 allows municipalities to pass a regulation requiring a bicyclist approaching an illuminated red traffic control signal to stop fully, yield to all other traffic and pedestrians and when safe to do so, cautiously proceed through the intersection or make a right-hand turn. A person on a bicycle or E-Bike shall not proceed through the intersection or turn right if an oncoming vehicle is turning or preparing to turn left in front of the person on the bicycle or E-Bike.
- e. Any local ordinance must be consistent with senate bill.

Devin Quince likes the idea of adopting a local ordinance consistent with the state legislation because there are no known downsides and just due to physics it makes sense. It is more difficult for a person riding a bicycle to come to a complete stop and then start again as opposed to a person driving a car. Chad expressed a concern that adopting the regulation locally might cause negative press on the part of people who drive cars. Heidi Quince stated that it would be necessary to educate people who drive cars about the benefits of the regulation. A show of hands revealed that members of the task force that were present unanimously support adopting an ordinance implementing SB-144 locally. Staff agreed to discuss this issue with more senior staff to seek direction on how to proceed.

- 6. Ben provided a summary of Colorado electric bike legislation (E-bikes) that went into effect on January 1, 2018. The provisions of the legislation includes the following:
  - a. After January 1, 2018 all E-Bikes are required to conform to one of three classifications:
    - i. Class 1: an electric bicycle that only provides assistance when the rider is pedaling; the motor ceases at 20 miles per hour.
    - ii. Class 2: An electric bicycle that provides assistance regardless of whether the rider is pedaling; the motor ceases at 20 miles per hour.
    - iii. Class 3: An electric bicycle that provides assistance only when the rider is pedaling; the motor ceases at 28 mph. Class 3 E-bikes must have a speedometer.
  - b. Class 1 and Class 2 electric bicycles are allowed on the same bicycle and pedestrian paths as conventional bicycles. Class 3 electric bicycles may not be ridden on a bicycle or pedestrian path unless the path is within a street or highway or permitted by a local jurisdiction. A local jurisdiction also has the authority to prohibit the operation of

electric bicycles on any bicycle or pedestrian path under its jurisdiction.

- c. No one under the age of 16 is allowed to ride a Class 3 electric bicycle, except as a passenger. Anyone on a Class 3 electric bicycle who is under the age of 18 must wear a helmet. Ben noted that the City has not passed an ordinance subsequent to the passage of the statewide e-bike legislation. Current ordinances do not prohibit the use of Class 1 or Class 2 E-Bikes on off-street bicycle paths. The operation of Class 3 E-bikes on the City's off-street trails must be consistent with state law.

Jim Wilson, a member of the Bicycling Task Force, could not be present and forwarded his feelings on the E-bike legislation through e-mail. Jim owns a class 3 electric bike and routinely rides on the city's bike paths, but never exceeds 12 miles per hour. He understands the intent of the law, but feels imposing speed limits would make more sense and that the law is discriminatory.

Chris Salt agreed with Jim that the legislation is discriminatory to class 3 E-bikes and felt that advisory signage might be a good option. Chris noted that persons riding non-electric bicycles are capable of riding faster than a person on an electric bike and felt that there are bicycle path segments that are long and straight with unlimited site distance where a person riding a bicycle should be allowed to ride as fast as they want. Chad suggested that pavement markings or signage could be used to encourage lower speeds on the approaches to curves and bike path segments with limited site distance. The task force made no recommendations with respect to specific regulations pertaining to E-bikes.

7. Ben noted that agenda item #6 regarding bicycle/automobile parking conflicts was added by the special request of the City Manager's office. Complaints were received by an individual about cars encroaching into bicycle facilities forcing individuals that ride bicycles into traffic lanes. Some of the streets in question were built years ago prior to any thought of accommodating both bicycles and automobiles. Phil noted that the original Bicycle Task Force requested that streets with a single white stripe delineating the travel lane and bicycle/parking lane be converted to include an additional white stripe to denote a bicycle lane. The city fulfilled the original Task Force's request out of a desire to make existing streets more multi-modal friendly and accommodate both people that drive and people that ride bicycles. The redesigns of streets with narrow cross-sections that don't leave much room for both a parking lane and bicycle lane has led to the problem. Ben noted that staff typically tries to address these types of complaints using the 3-E approach. The first approach would be education (educating people who ride bicycles and people that drive cars about their responsibilities and what different types of striping means), second would be enforcement, and third would be engineering.

Chris encouraged the use of educational tools. Devin felt that bicycles are a vulnerable form of transportation and noted some difficult conflicts that bicycles have to encounter.

Tyler noted that there are three engineering options. The first would include widening the street which is unlikely. The second would include taking away parking which is very unpopular, and the third option would be to replace the bike lane with sharrows.

Chad asked about a redesign of the road to have the bicycle lane closest to the curb with the cars adjacent to the travel lane.

Chris suggested a road diet to narrow down the lanes to slow down traffic. Tyler noted that trash trucks mirror to mirror are 9-1/2' leaving little room for the trucks to pass one another when traveling in opposite directions.

Devin noted that Longmont is a reactive City and needs to be pro-active. Tyler noted that the city is looking at making changes to the street design standards for future development.

Devin noted that an answer is education and that both sides need to compromise especially on low-volume streets.

8. Ben asked if anybody had anything they wanted to add to the agenda items Parking Lot.
  - a. Chris suggested that the city look at how others are doing things and addressing bicycle-related issues. Chad agreed and felt it would be good to develop a "best practices" guide (Education & Design Best Practices Guide)
  - b. Devin suggested that the changes the City made to the 2010 Model Traffic Code as it pertains to people that ride bikes being required to dismount at intersections should be changed to the original language consistent with the Model Traffic Code (Municipal Code Amendments).
  - c. Devin discussed the issue of rolling coal and complained that the Police Department won't right tickets without them personally witnessing the act even if a witness can produce video evidence of the violation. Devin noted that the Colorado State Patrol will enforce violations with video evidence and send "fix it" tickets. Devin would like to see an ordinance passed requiring the Police Department to accept video evidence as proof of violations (Municipal Code Amendments).
9. The meeting adjourned at 8:30.