

MINUTES

CITY OF FORT COLLINS • BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS



BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TYPE OF MEETING –REGULAR

May 22, 2023 6:00 p.m.

Hybrid Meeting – Zoom and 281 North College Avenue, Fort Collins, CO

FOR REFERENCE:

Chair:	Dave Dixon
Vice-Chair:	Jordan Williams
Staff Liaison:	Cortney Geary

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Dixon called the meeting to order at 6:01 PM.

2. ROLL CALL (INTRODUCTIONS)

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dave Dixon, Chair, Bike Fort Collins

Jordan Williams, Vice Chair, At Large Member

Ed Peyronnin, Colorado State University

Campus Bicycle Advisory Committee

Danielle Buttke (for Kevin Krause), Natural Resources Advisory Board

Rob Owens, Transportation Board

Elisabeth Cairnes, At Large Member

Marcia Richards, Parks and Recreation Board

Bruce Henderson, Senior Advisory Board

Jonathan Crozier, Poudre School District

Tim Anderson, Fort Collins Bike Co-op

Todd Dangerfield, Downtown Development Authority

David Hansen, Colorado State University

Scott Mason, Land Conservation and Stewardship Board

Whitney Allison, At Large Member

ABSENT:

Greg Boiarsky, Air Quality Advisory Board

CITY STAFF PRESENT:

Dave “DK” Kemp

PUBLIC PRESENT:

MINUTES

CITY OF FORT COLLINS • BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS



BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TYPE OF MEETING – REGULAR

3. AGENDA REVIEW

Chair Dixon stated there were no changes to the published agenda.

4. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

None.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – APRIL 2023

Buttke stated she submitted some name changes for the April minutes.

(**Secretary's Note: Whitney Allison arrived at this point in the meeting.)

Buttke made a motion, seconded by Owens, to approve the minutes of the April 2023 meeting as amended. The motion was adopted unanimously.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

a. Memo in Support of Recreational Bicycling Facilities

Henderson asked if the memo is requesting the formation of a new plan. Chair Dixon replied the language does not necessarily reference development of a formal plan but instead states the BAC recommends FC Moves and Parks and Recreation should jointly plan for recreational bicycling facilities in support of community needs, perhaps in a more informal way.

Crozier made a motion, seconded by Henderson, to approve sending the memo in support of recreational bicycling facilities to the Transportation Board. The motion was adopted unanimously.

b. Memo in Support of Revising City Code Related to Micromobility Parking

Chair Dixon commented on the memo as presented. Dangerfield asked if the devices can be parked in parking spaces in Old Town or other areas. Chair Dixon concurred the language may need to be made more specific.

Rachel Ruhlen, FC Moves, stated the traffic code referenced relates to where personally owned bicycles and E-bikes cannot be parked. She stated there can be rules that are not in the ordinance as part of the SPIN regulations.

Geary stated it may be helpful to specify the details of Traffic Code 2108 and also specify what items would be included in the SPIN contract related to the devices not being allowed to park in metered or managed parking spaces, including within residential parking permit zones.

Owens questioned how this change will provide a benefit. Ruhlen replied it would allow for educational outreach opportunities.

Chair Dixon asked about the warnings or penalties associated with improper

BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TYPE OF MEETING – REGULAR

parking according to rules created. Ruhlen replied the first offense is a warning, the second is a one-day suspension, and the third is a permanent ban on the account, which is appealable, but must be a minimum of 15 days.

Owens stated he does not agree with enforcing the rules in residential areas, even if they are part of the residential permit program. Peyronnin also commented that sidewalks will be used by children and such in the residential areas.

Chair Dixon noted there are residential areas in the Downtown district. Dangerfield stated his concerns are more about the core of the downtown area.

Geary suggested the Committee could put forth a recommendation that SPIN vehicles would be allowed to park in non-managed, non-metered parking areas except for the residential parking permit zone and Ruhlen could sort out the details with Parking Services. Additionally, she suggested SPIN could be asked not to deploy vehicles to the residential parking permit zones.

Chair Dixon suggested possibly revising 24-179 to cover the issues being discussed as it is very specific to SPIN and E-scooters. Ruhlen replied she has discussed both options with the City Attorney's Office.

Chair Dixon requested input on whether this memo should include recommendations on some of the SPIN contractual rules. Geary replied that would likely be helpful to inform the Transportation Board discussion.

Chair Dixon asked if everyone is in agreement with removing 24-179 and proposing that SPIN devices get included in 2108. Members replied in the affirmative.

Ruhlen noted this item is scheduled for Council consideration July 18th and would therefore need to go to the Transportation Board in June which would mean the BAC would not have a chance to consider a revised draft.

Richards expressed concern about SPIN devices being left in residential permitted parking spaces for multiple days given cars can only park in those areas without a permit for two hours. Chair Dixon noted the SPIN contract could be amended to ensure the devices are removed within a certain timeframe.

Geary suggested the Committee could vote at this meeting and read the new draft memo to ensure comments were properly captured prior to it going to the Transportation Board. However, she stated if one member of the Committee disagreed the new memo reflects what was voted upon, the memo could not move forward as business cannot be conducted over email.

Cairnes stated she would prefer to abstain from this vote given there was a presentation on the issue prior to her joining the Committee and she had several

BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TYPE OF MEETING – REGULAR

questions. Chair Dixon replied an abstention would be appropriate due to lack of familiarity with the issue.

Cairnes stated her main questions are related to whether there would be a possibility of creating more designated parking spaces for the devices. She also expressed concern about placing private and shared E-scooters in the same category. Ruhlen replied painted parking boxes are being installed primarily on asphalt but also on some wider sidewalks. She commented on the way the Traffic Code addresses all the devices and suggested personally owned E-scooters should be included with E-bike and bikes with shared micromobility being separated; however, she stated it seems cleaner to have all of the devices in the same area, though it could be addressed either way.

Cairnes asked if it would be appropriate to delay making other changes until the effectiveness of the parking boxes is ascertained. Ruhlen replied staff's thinking was to throw all counter measures up as quickly as possible with a new study on effectiveness being completed in the fall.

Geary discussed the changes to the memo per the Committee's discussion, including specifying what is articulated in Traffic Code 2108, adding more data about the impact of this change to show how many scooters and bikes observed that were blocking access and were illegally parked would have a legal parking space if the code were to change, and specifying that the types of things the Committee would like to see in the SPIN contract are that the vehicles could park on street except for in the managed and metered parking spaces. She asked if the Committee wanted to offer a recommendation as to whether to allow on-street parking of the vehicles in residential permit parking zones.

Chair Dixon noted those zones are likely populated by frequent SPIN users and asked how many members are supportive of including a recommendation that the SPIN vehicles could park on street in residential permit parking zones but not in any other metered or managed parking areas. He noted this could be changed in the future as it would be part of the SPIN contract language and not part of the Traffic Code language. Members replied in the affirmative.

Vice Chair Williams made a motion, seconded by Dangerfield, to approve the memo as written with the inclusion of the changes as stipulated by Geary and for consideration over email prior to the next Transportation Board meeting. The motion was adopted unanimously with Cairnes abstaining.