



# SIERRA VISTA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION BICYCLE PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY, MAY 4, 2021

**DRAFT**

---

## MEETING LOCATION:

Sierra Vista Public Works Bld.  
Training Room  
401 Giulio Cesare Ave.  
Sierra Vista, AZ 85635

## MEETING DATE AND TIME:

May 4, 2021  
10:00 AM



---

## Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

### MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Cochise County Bicycle Advocates: Stu Carter (*for very early part of meeting*)  
Regional Bicycle and Running Club: Steve Schumann  
Hereford/Palominos Rep: Byron Baker  
ADOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordination: Donna Lewandowski (*Telephonically*)

### MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE

Buena HS Mountain Bike Club: John Healy  
Cochise County Health and Social Services: Carl Hooper  
Whetstone/Huachuca City Rep: Kara Harris

### STAFF:

SVMPO Administrator: Karen L. Lamberton, AICP

### OTHERS PRESENT:

---

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

The BPAC meeting was called to order at 10:08 a.m.

This was an informational item.

#### 2. ACCEPTANCE OF MEETING MINUTES of March 2, 2021.

BPAC attendees reviewed and accepted the March 2, 2021 BPAC Regular Meeting Summary. *As per the consensus of the BPAC members acceptance of meeting summaries is desired rather than formal action to approve meeting minutes. Revisions will be made by SVMPO staff as directed by the BPAC attendees.*

This was a discussion/consensus item.

### CONTINUING BUSINESS: PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION

#### 3. SVMPO LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE:

##### **Bicycle and Pedestrian Public Input, Draft LRTP Sections and Map**

Materials were made available to the BPAC members on potential bike/ped projects.

Member Schumann suggested that it would be important to prioritize projects, then do the fiscal constraints exercise, and for the plan to provide a future/parking lot set of projects for unexpected funding that might become available for unfunded projects.

Members Schumann and Baker wonder if these lists should be merged or separated into specific bicycle and pedestrian components. There was also discussion about how pedestrian activities separate out from recreational uses, like trails that are used for mountain bicycling. Hiking is a different sort of pedestrian use than access from an apartment complex to a store, for example. Funding should ensure a percentage to each mode, the observation was made that by calling something a multi-use path that is primarily for bicycling can short-change the infrastructure funding committed just for walkers. After discussion, it seemed like a merged list might be best.

BPAC recommended the following overarching top priorities:

- Gap filling
- Enhancements to improve existing facilities, in particular to fix safety issues
- Extensions to destinations
- Enhancements to wayfinding, water supply

Maintenance remains the highest priority – without maintenance good existing facilities become something none of the bicyclists will ride or feel safe for walking. Funding adequate maintenance is a very high concern noted at this, and other BPAC meetings. Ms. Lewandowski observed maintenance for bicycle/shoulders is low on the State priority list too. There is a need for a State-Wide Bike/Ped advocacy group, but one does not exist at this time. Commitments by the State for expending a percentage of transportation on alternative modes, e.g. specific funding dedicated to Transportation Enhancements, would be helpful to encourage ADOT Districts to include those kinds of facilities.

It also seemed important to analyze use, if a facility is only used once in a while, it may not be the highest priority to keep functioning when those funds are needed for repairs on higher use paths or sidewalks.

FTA funds can be used for sidewalks within ¼ a mile of bus shelters, add ADA improvements.

The BPAC members wondered if the consulting team had mapped activity centers, the SVMPO Administrator thought they had, but an overlay on top of existing sidewalks might be helpful to choosing projects.

Specific recreational areas noted for possible recreational trailhead amenities were:

- Hereford Rd. Bridge
- San Pedro House
- Highway 92 along bridge
- Charleston Rd. areas
- Murry Springs signs

The 2050 LRTP preliminary project lists are expected in early summer and will be sent to BPAC members for review and comment. This was an information and discussion item.

#### **4. BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITY SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS**

Several specific locations of concern have been identified by members of the Cochise Bicycle Advocates as well as other members of the public. These areas and photographs were discussed by the BPAC attendees. It was questioned if Mountain Bikes could get through vehicle barriers with a 4.5' gap – blocking ATV's but usually bicyclist have to carry bikes over recreational trailhead pedestrian entrances. Administrator Lamberton stated she would check with John Healy, the Buena Mountain Bicyclist Coach.

The conflicts and needs for ATV users was briefly discussed. It seems that ATV use conflicts with traditional bicycle riders but yet ATV users are a recreational use that seem to need a specific place to go ride that is not disruptive or cause a safety issue for other users. The City has been asked to look into the varied widths of bollards used throughout the City and use a consistent standard that actually prevents ATV users while allowing the other users safe access.

This was an information and discussion item. No action was taken on this item.

#### **5. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS & MEETING DATE/TIMES**

The next BPAC meeting is scheduled for **Tuesday, August 3, 2021 at 10 a.m.**

It was mentioned that this group did not have specifically detailed action items. Key documentation did not seem to be followed up on e.g. requests for tribute plan made at last meeting. Safety issues seem to be discussed but no resolution reported back.

Follow-up with members sooner after meetings would be preferred as meetings are quarterly, and it seems to be a long time between requests and resolution. The SVMPO Administrator concurs but observes that the SVMPO is a very, very small, staffed organization, just 1.5 FTE's at this time, and she expressed concern that the BPAC group simply is struggling to have members attend. Understandably the pandemic events have made the last year very difficult for everyone, especially those we would like to attend from our health organizations.

This was an information and discussion item. No action was taken on this item.

#### **6. ANNOUNCEMENTS, UPDATES AND GENERAL CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

No specific announcements were made.

*Members of the Advisory Sub-Committee may not take formal action on matters not specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.01 (H) action taken as a result of public comment is limited to responding to any criticism, directing staff to review the matter, or scheduling the matter for discussion at a later date.*

This was an information and discussion item.

#### **7. ADJOURNMENT**

The committee adjourned by general consent at approximately 11:38 p.m.