

## Disability Advisory Board REGULAR MEETING

Monday, March 17, 2025 – 5:30 PM

300 Laporte Avenue and Microsoft Teams

### 1. CALL TO ORDER: 5:30 PM

### 2. ROLL CALL

- a. Board Members Present – Linda Drees (Chair), Terry Schlicting (Vice Chair), Joseph Tiner, Amber Kelley, Scott Winnegrad, Amanda Morgan
- b. Board Members Absent – Rachel Knox Stutsman, Jaclyn Menendez, Kristin White
- c. Staff Members Present – Jan Reece
- d. Guest(s) – Liri, Matthew Cicanese

### 3. AGENDA REVIEW

No changes.

### 4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

None.

### 5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – FEBRUARY 10, 2025

***Kelley made a motion to approve February 10, 2025 minutes as presented. Tiner seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.***

### 6. BUDGET

Reece noted the current remaining budget is \$5,298.12.

### 7. GUEST PRESENTER

#### a. Rachel Ruhlen – Which Wheels Go Where

Rachel Ruhlen, FC Moves Transportation Planner, stated Which Wheels Go Where is exploring how to accommodate more types of micromobility, as that supports climate, active modes, and Vision Zero goals. Additionally, the project is concurrent with the Strategic Trails Plan update as paved trails are the way some kinds of micromobility are accommodated.

Ruhlen outlined the variety of devices that encompass micromobility and noted the devices can be either human- or electric-powered. She stated the current regulations around where various micromobility devices can be used are very confusing. Additionally, the current category of 'toy vehicles' is complicated; therefore, the proposal is to separate them into two categories: human-powered vehicles and lightweight electric vehicles, which would have a top speed of 20 miles per hour. Anything that goes faster than that would be classified as a low-powered scooter.

Ruhlen discussed the proposal for changing the regulations regarding what micromobility devices can be utilized where, including allowing human-powered and lightweight electric vehicles to use streets, bike lanes, sidewalks, and paved trails. She acknowledged that proposal may not be the ultimate regulation, but it would be the simplest.

Ruhlen discussed the public outreach efforts, which included a survey and had a focus on lower-income communities. She outlined the survey results in terms of concerns and stated the open-ended comments summary showed a need to accommodate micromobility while protecting pedestrians, people with disabilities, seniors, and children. Additionally, it was noted that how people ride is more important than what they ride; therefore, strategies for moving forward should be more about behavior than controlling which types of vehicles travel where.

Ruhlen noted Fort Collins Police Services is very concerned that allowing skateboards on streets will lead to severe crashes; however, CSU Police do not allow skateboards on sidewalks, only on streets. She noted Boulder has allowed skateboards on streets since 2021 and Boulder Police also expected to see an increase in severe crashes, though that has not been the case. Ruhlen stated there is some interest in having an actual enforceable speed limit for trails rather than the courtesy limit; however, there are concerns that having a posted speed limit could lead to expectations of patrols and enforcement, and there are limited resources and challenges with enforcement. Therefore, the recommendation is for a safety and education approach to control behavior, which is what has been used in Boulder. Additionally, Ruhlen noted Park Rangers do not have the authority to detain or pursue and instead use a technique called "Authority of the Resource" wherein the Ranger deemphasizes the regulation and invites the individual to discuss the needs of the trail or area to place the onus back onto the community member.

Ruhlen outlined possible changes to the regulations around which types of devices could be used where and noted dismount zones will not change. She requested input from the Board regarding concerns and opportunities.

Kelley stated she rides on the sidewalk due to the fact that if she has a seizure and falls, she would not want to be on a street. She asked how trail users are made aware of the courtesy speed limit of 15 miles per hour. Ruhlen replied there are a few signs on the paved trails; however, the Strategic Trails Plan update includes a four-pronged education approach which involves center line

striping, some trail widening, slow down warning signage, and potentially more courtesy speed limit signage.

Kelley suggested utilizing mirrors on the trails to allow users to be seen by others.

Liri asked if the courtesy speed limit is for electric vehicles or those with speedometers. Ruhlen replied a posted speed limit and the courtesy speed limit apply to everyone, and there is a challenge with users not having speedometers.

Winnegrad commended education efforts, particularly the engagement and mutual respect approach used by Rangers.

Kelley asked about the possibility of having signs that would show the speed users are going. Ruhlen replied those signs, which can be self-powered, cost about \$4,000 each, though no budget has been identified at this point.

Winnegrad asked if there are statistics available on injuries or complaints. Ruhlen replied crashes involving micromobility devices are underreported, and if a police report is not filed, it is very difficult to gather any data. She noted there is a database of complaints and crashes that have been reported, and those are few in number.

Chair Drees asked if Ruhlen is requesting support from the Board. Ruhlen replied she is just seeking feedback this evening.

**b. Katlyn Kelly – Transfort requesting suggestions from DAB on labeling**

Katlyn Kelly, Transfort, discussed the new draft labels that may be added to the Transfort website which would include information as to whether the bus stop has an accessible concrete pad or accessible pad and connecting path. She requested input from the Board regarding the clarity of the labels, the actual symbols being used, and which phrases would be most informative for trip planning decisions.

Winnegrad commended the use of blue for the symbols.

Cicanese stated the only icon consideration may be that not all mobility challenges involve a wheelchair; however, he commended the design overall.

Vice Chair Schlicting stated people tend to look for the wheelchair symbol when considering transportation accessibility.

Tiner concurred with Vice Chair Schlicting and supported the use of the word 'path' rather than 'sidewalk' to help keep the language used within Transfort consistent.

Vice Chair Schlicting asked if one symbol is better than another for color contrast. Tiner replied anything that is high-contrast should be fine.