

MINUTES

CITY OF FORT COLLINS • BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS



TRANSPORTATION BOARD

TYPE OF MEETING – REGULAR

January 15, 2020, 6:00 p.m.

Conference Room A, 281 North College Avenue, Fort Collins, CO

FOR REFERENCE:

Chair:	Indy Hart	
Vice Chair:	Nathalie Rachline	
Council Liaison:	Kristin Stephens	
Staff Liaison:	Paul Sizemore	970.224.6140

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Hart called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

2. ROLL CALL

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Indy Hart, Chair
Nathalie Rachline, Vice Chair (via phone)
Jerry Gavaldon (via phone)
York
Ellen Boeke
Cari Brown (arrived late)

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

Valerie Arnold

CITY STAFF PRESENT:

Cameron Gloss
Tessa Greegor
Aaron Iverson

PUBLIC PRESENT:

None

MINUTES

CITY OF FORT COLLINS • BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS



TRANSPORTATION BOARD

TYPE OF MEETING – REGULAR

3. AGENDA REVIEW

Sizemore stated there were no changes to the published agenda.

4. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

None.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – DECEMBER 2019

Chair Hart stated various changes to the minutes were recommended. Sizemore outlined the wording changes. York made a motion, seconded by Boeke, to approve the December 2019 minutes as amended. The motion was adopted unanimously.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

7. NEW BUSINESS

a. Harmony Gateway Plan – Action – Cameron Gloss

Cameron Gloss, Long Range Planning Director, stated the goal of the Harmony Gateway Plan is to develop new policies, standards, and guidelines that relate to a 420-acre area west of I-25 centered on Harmony Road going a mile to the north and half-mile to the south. He discussed the development in Timnath on the east side of I-25, but noted the west side is largely undeveloped. He showed slides of existing conditions in the area noting a great deal of the area is within a floodway or floodplain. He stated some of the existing ponds in the area are allowed and others are not.

Gloss outlined the proposed land uses for the area: 50% or less retail/commercial, greater than 25% employment, and greater than 25% residential, which is a dramatically different use mix than was originally envisioned. He noted civic and cultural uses would be exempt from these calculations which will hopefully incentivize some of those uses.

Boeke asked if there is any type of direction or restriction on parking lot sizes. Gloss replied there are screening requirements and height limitations that will likely push lot configurations and sizes toward generally smaller sizes.

Chair Hart clarified this will influence development plans but is not a development plan itself.

Gloss discussed the public input received on building height and stated the ultimate recommendation is for 3-story heights for residential and 6-story heights for non-residential and mixed-use; however, any mixed-use structure that has 6 stories and contains residential uses must have structured parking.

TRANSPORTATION BOARD

TYPE OF MEETING – REGULAR

Gloss stated staff is proposing requiring stealth cell tower installations. He discussed some of the natural features of the area.

(**Secretary's Note: Brown arrived during the presentation.)

Chair Hart stated he is impressed with what has been kept in mind for the feel of the area including the adjustments to the mix of uses. He mentioned the possibility of utilizing some of the area for natural education. Gloss noted the water encumbrances lead to safety concerns in the area which has been a sticking point for the Natural Areas program.

Chair Hart suggested placement of interpretive signage could be helpful for some type of historical and natural context.

York asked how a trail for pedestrian-powered uses would count toward the mix of uses percentages. Gloss replied it would be part of satisfying the 40% naturalistic coverage goal but would not have any impact on the use mix ratios.

Gavaldon made a motion, seconded by Boeke, to recommend adoption of the Harmony Corridor Plan to City Council as presented.

The motion was adopted unanimously.

b. E-Bike Pilot Program – Action – Tessa Greegor

Greegor discussed the various steps that led to the formation of the one-year pilot program to allow class 1 and 2 E-bikes on paved trails. She stated Council would need to take action prior to the end of the pilot program, on April 30th, in order for it not to end. She noted class 3 E-bikes were not included in the state regulations nor this pilot program.

Brown asked if it is possible to change a regular bike to an electric bike or to upgrade the class of an E-bike. Greegor replied that is likely possible, but that would not necessarily make a legal E-bike which are labeled as such by manufacturers.

Greegor outlined the goals of the pilot program and detailed the results of the survey data received throughout the pilot.

Members discussed speed limits and appropriate associated signage. York suggested the possibility of having speedometers on trails as many bicycles do not have their own.

Greegor stated the overall takeaways from the survey results include support for allowing class 1 E-bikes on paved trails and some additional opposition but overall support for allowing class 2 E-bikes on paved trails. She stated no crash reports were received and very few incidents were reported, though she acknowledged there were likely unreported crashes.

Members discussed incidents they have had on paved trails with cyclists and other

TRANSPORTATION BOARD

TYPE OF MEETING – REGULAR

users.

Greegor discussed survey data related to age restrictions and noted class 3 E-bikes have both an age and helmet restriction, though class 1 and 2 do not. She also discussed information related to the number of E-bikes sold locally stating the number more than doubled from 2018 to 2019. She stated the majority of those sold locally have been class 1.

York noted the cost savings for buying a class 2 E-bike online versus in the store is significant which may be a reason for lower local sales of class 2 bikes.

Boeke asked how much a class 1 bike typically costs. Chair Hart replied they are between \$500 and \$800 and a basic class 2 is \$1,000, or \$1,400 fully outfitted online.

Greegor discussed the methodology used to garner speed information on trails and resulting data. She also discussed data related to observations of unsafe behavior.

Greegor outlined next steps in this process and stated the staff recommendation will be finalized after garnering input from boards and commissions. She stated the Parks Department is currently in the process of updating its policy plan which will provide a good opportunity for having conversations around trail philosophy and management. She stated the current staff recommendation is to allow class 1 and 2 E-bikes on paved trails with ongoing monitoring. She stated the alternative recommendation would be to just allow class 1 with or without a continued pilot for class 2.

Brown clarified any individual with a disability can use a class 2 E-bike or other motorized device on a trail regardless of the outcome of this pilot.

Brown asked what signage changes are planned for unpaved trails and to inform individuals that gas-powered bikes are not E-bikes. Greegor replied some signs already exist and the specific plan for additional signage has yet to be outlined.

Sizemore noted that the staff team that developed the proposed recommendation included a variety of opinions covering the full range of possible recommendations. For the record, he indicated that Nancy Nichols, the Safe Routes to School coordinator, wanted to ensure boardmembers are considering impacts on youth trail users. Sizemore stated Nichols does not believe E-bikes should be allowed on paved trails and had reported negative interactions with e-bike users while using the trail system with children. The board acknowledged this position.

Chair Hart made a motion, seconded by Rachline, that the Board support the staff recommendation to allow class 1 and class 2 E-bikes on paved trails.

Boeke expressed support for the motion and requested additional information regarding Nichols' position. Sizemore replied Nichols had weighed what she perceived as the benefits of E-bikes versus the potential risks for youth in particular,

TRANSPORTATION BOARD

TYPE OF MEETING – REGULAR

and found the risks to outweigh the benefits.

Chair Hart noted there is potential for allowing E-bikes to change the feel of the trail as there may be more bikes and a greater average speed. He stated his desire is to see more trail use and this is one way of affecting change in that regard.

Brown stated she would hesitantly oppose the motion as she is in support of replacing car trips, however, she does not feel the paved trails are at the infrastructure level they need to be to support more E-bikes. She also noted there will be increased numbers of E-bikes as costs decrease.

York suggested infrastructure needs to be improved as the number of users increase and stated the discussion of policies around all E-devices in future trail management needs to occur sooner rather than later.

Gavaldon stated there may need to be some additional education on sharing trails.

The motion was adopted with Brown voting in the negative.

c. Master Street Plan Amendment – Action – Aaron Iverson

Iverson outlined the purpose of the Master Street Plan, discussed proposed changes to railroad locations made since last month, and stated he is seeking a recommendation to City Council from the Board.

Members discussed the proposed changes. York suggested using different colors on the map for different priority levels. Members discussed whether the plan provides potential or desired changes. Iverson replied he would not recommend illustrating priorities on the map as the plan is not intended to show timing.

Iverson noted the large categories of changes for this recommendation include reclassifications, the addition of roundabouts, and railroad crossing shifts.

Chair Hart asked what impact York sees for the Board providing support for the draft as presented. York replied it could be improved by including references to the railroad crossing study.

York made a motion, seconded by Boeke, to recommend to City Council approval of the Master Street Plan as presented with the addition of a reference to the railroad crossing study.

The motion was adopted unanimously.

d. Annual Report – Action – Paul Sizemore

Sizemore stated an annual report is required to be submitted to Council and discussed the draft he provided.

York suggested including mention of the board liaisons and members' attendance at super issue meetings.

TRANSPORTATION BOARD

TYPE OF MEETING – REGULAR

Brown made a motion, seconded by Boeke, to approve the annual report as amended.

The motion was adopted unanimously.

e. Board Elections – Action – Boardmembers

Chair Hart and Vice Chair Rachline stated they would both be willing to hold the positions again.

Brown made a motion, seconded by Gavaldon, to nominate Hart for the Chair position and Rachline for the Vice Chair position.

The motion was adopted unanimously.

8. BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

Rachline stated she would like to see an agenda item related to safety issues of ice and snow on the roads and sidewalks.

York reported on using Transfort for a daily commute and on using the Roaring Fork Valley transit system which is partially funded by a mill levy. He agreed he would like to see a report on ice and snow issues and reported on the recent Planning and Zoning Board meeting during which the jail expansion on Midpoint Drive, the Harmony Gateway Plan, and a new manufactured housing zone district were discussed.

Brown discussed road upgrades associated with Montava noting there are many upset neighbors in the area.

Chair Hart reported on the recent Parking Advisory Board meeting noting the Board does not have a quorum and can therefore not take action.

9. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Bicycle Advisory Committee Report

Gavaldon reported the BAC has not met since the last Transportation Board meeting.

b. City Council 6-Month Calendar Review

Sizemore stated Council approved the first reading of the Montava PUD last night. He noted the Master Street Plan portion was approved last night as a resolution which will not require a second reading.

Sizemore stated the Hughes property rezoning second reading has been scheduled for January 21st and the Harmony Gateway Plan is scheduled for March 3rd. The mobility worksession, which has been rescheduled a few times, is now scheduled for February 25th.

c. Staff Liaison Report

MINUTES

CITY OF FORT COLLINS • BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS



TRANSPORTATION BOARD

TYPE OF MEETING – REGULAR

Sizemore reported on upcoming agenda items and stated he will include a report by the Streets Department as suggested. He stated the new Planning, Development, and Transportation Director is set to be at the February meeting and the new attorney assigned to the Board will be visiting.

Sizemore noted this is the beginning of a budgeting for outcomes year.

Chair Hart requested members make an effort to attend any meeting with an action item on the agenda as quorum issues may arise over the next few months.

York noted the next super issue meeting is February 24th.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m. by unanimous consent.