



PO Box 23851
Flagstaff, AZ 86002
info@flagstaffbiking.org

Sarah Dechter
Comprehensive Planning Manager
City of Flagstaff
Submitted via electronic mail: SDechter@flagstaffaz.gov

Sarah-

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, and thank you for accepting our input in this rough-outline format. We appreciate the work of you and your team to help get these comments appropriately placed throughout the Draft.

Since Sam wrote some of this, and Anthony wrote some, there are two different sections that are arranged differently, just for some insight as to what's here.

Please let us know if you have any questions whatsoever. Hopefully we've been clear, but we understand that this outline is a bit of a less orthodox approach than we would normally use.

Sincerely-

Anthony Quintile, Sam Meier and Joe Hazel
On behalf of the Board of Flagstaff Biking Organization

Rec and Trans -Trails, of any classification, can serve as both recreation and transportation infrastructure.

“Governments and departments should coordinate for planning and implementation of trails, and share expertise, personnel and equipment, as is appropriate in order to assure the best outcomes for the active transportation system.”

Rec-Provide definitions of “active recreation” and “passive recreation” in order to ensure that application of the Regional Plan is cohesive and relevant on these issues. Definitions vary for these terms and this ambiguity has already been an issue with City planning efforts. We recommend “active” to mean things like baseball diamonds, swimming pools, ball courts. Passive should mean trails and interpretive sites/wildlife viewing areas. Note that these definitions describe infrastructure and not activities.

Trans-Change the first sentence of the “Transportation” header in the Executive Summary and Goals and Policies to something like:

“The Transportation goals and policies support the safe and efficient movement of people and commerce through all modalities while respecting diverse land uses, the local economy, and environmental and public health.”

Trans-The Regional Plan should acknowledge that, if population growth and corresponding vehicular traffic continues to grow as expected, then setting (Level of Service) unreasonable expectations about vehicle capacity within planning best practices and/or ordinances as a primary benchmark is an untenable approach. There is simply not enough space, especially within Flagstaff proper, to provide for currently prescribed planning objectives in the projected traffic volumes. Increases in traffic congestion in the greater Flagstaff area is unavoidable given real world constraints.

Trans-Rather than nearly exclusively relying upon fundamentally flawed forecasting and designs that will fail to provide for the traffic volumes predicted by those forecasts, planning should focus on providing desirable alternative means for citizens to get around without sitting in single-occupant vehicles in traffic.

Trans-Adopt the Safe Streets Master Plan into a comprehensive, modern, revised set of City and County ordinances setting prescriptions for neighborhood, street and intersection design that accommodates pedestrians, bicyclists, vulnerable road users of all ages and abilities, and transit. Cite the Safe Streets Master Plan recommended code revisions, (currently in-progress with MetroPlan), for adoption into City Code, maybe here: (Goals and Policies) *“Policy DP.1: Reform development regulations to transform Urban and Suburban Centers and Corridors into compact, walkable places that feature multifamily housing, commercial, and mixed-use development with highly connected street and transit systems and dynamic public spaces.”*

If the use of Level Of Service is unavoidable, for example when local agencies are interacting with ADOT, insist that the appropriate type of LOS metrics are invoked to include LOS for Bicycles and Pedestrians. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Level_of_service_\(transportation\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Level_of_service_(transportation))

Trans-Proactively pursue regional transit that accommodates bicycles on buses

Rec- The Regional Plan should acknowledge the economic benefits of tourism generated by well-developed trail systems as a key component to the local economy that local governments are engaged in managing in various ways. The value of tourism should be discussed in Chapter 8 (Parks Recreation and Open Space)

Rec- The value of easy access to diverse trails based recreational opportunities in generating advocates and stewards for open space and the environment, especially for children, should be described in both Chapter 8 (PROS) and Chapter 7 (Resource Stewardship and Resilience). Activities like mountain biking are far more apt to draw interest from kids, thereby getting them off of their electronic devices and out of the house, than other forms of passive recreation like bird watching or hiking. This is crucial in fostering a new generation of advocates for the environment. In fact there are peer-reviewed studies indicating that recreation opportunities generate more support for conservation.

Rec- The Flagstaff Trails Initiative Regional Trails Strategy should be specifically and directly acknowledged and cited/used as direction for its highly vetted role in establishing direction for trails management in the region. It should not be considered included by default through the ATMP because it overlaps City, County, USFS and potentially other jurisdictions. Additionally, it is targeted primarily at recreational planning and infrastructure rather than at transportation infrastructure.

Rec and Trans- Add additional detail to maps including the [Flagstaff Loop Trail](#), [FTI Regional Trails Strategy](#), [Mount Elden Dry Lake Hills Recreation Plan \(MEDL\)](#), (especially FUTS style trail along the front of Elden), [Doney Park Multimodal Study](#), propose County FUTS style trails to Kachina-Mountaineer, Baderville, Doney Park-Timberline, and others.

Chapter 3: Goals and Policies

Growth Management

- In GM.1, consider adding other language to indicate that areas “served by roads” should include multi-modal options (e.g. bike lanes, multimodal paths, FUTS trails, etc.)

Development Patterns

- Multiple subcomponents address “safe and convenient” infrastructure for walking, biking, multimodal transit. If possible, address how safety and convenience will be assessed in other planning documents. One avenue may be to gather pre- and post-implementation data about safety and convenience (surveys, crash data, etc.).

Neighborhoods and Equity

- Historically disenfranchised neighborhoods/communities often also lack safe and comfortable ped/bike infrastructure (e.g. sidewalks in Sunnyside, etc.). Consider adding language regarding multi modal & transit infrastructure to this section.

Transportation System

- Rephrase “more appealing to pedestrians and cyclists” to be stronger language (e.g. “safe, comfortable, and convenient for pedestrians and cyclists”).
- Policy TS.1: To support this policy, it may be useful to provide suggestions for metrics to assess whether the safety and protection of vulnerable road users has been prioritized. Ideally, this would go beyond crash data, since many collisions are not reported to the police.
- Suggest rewording Policy TS.5 to de-emphasize or remove roadway categorization, as this seems counterproductive to the goal of determining appropriate infrastructure based on local context.

Multimodal Transportation

- In order to assess or demonstrate an increase in use of bicycling and pedestrian infrastructure, as outlined in MT.1, current use data will need to be collected and re-collected routinely after improvements are made. This data collection and analysis could potentially be addressed in the Transportation chapter or in the ATMP.

Parking

- Ideally, bicycle and multimodal device parking should be included or addressed in this goal or addressed in the Transportation chapter.