

MINUTES OF MEETING

Parks, Open Space and Trails Advisory Board – August 23, 2017 Ada County Parks and Waterways Administration building

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chris Cook, Kari Kostka, Marc Grubert, Mark Suderman, Julia Kertz-Grant, David McKinnon

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jim Keller

STAFF PRESENT: Scott Koberg and Candy Hahlbeck

OTHER: Meg Basham (Development Services), Deborah Fulkerson (Ada County IT), Phylis King (State Representative)

INTRODUCTION:

C. Cook called the meeting to order at 12:08 p.m. No conflicts of interest were declared by Advisory Board members.

Motion: C. Cook moved to approve the minutes. K. Kostka seconded. Motion passed

OLD BUSINESS

JPD GREENBELT:

Scott supplied an update on the JPD Greenbelt. There are areas where the Army Corps wants to see touched up from the debris left from the HESCO barriers until we get to previous soil at ground level. We currently have a crew out there today working on that component as well as installing temporary fencing. Sunroc continues to use heavy equipment to remove the heavier debris that remains in the flood plain. Until this debris is removed it doesn't make sense to try and open this pathway. In the meantime, the chain link fence still remains across the West Bridge. In addition to the temporary fencing, temporary signage will also be added that will read Caution uneven surface, use at your own risk. This is due to the debris that will remain on the asphalt until further notice.

As for long term, Scott found out this week that Idaho Department of Lands, which oversees the gravel pit operations, crafted a directive that stated this would be fixed before the next flood cycle. S. Koberg responded that we don't have any current plan to repave that section. M. Grubert inquired what until the next flood means. S. Koberg responded that it mean by spring.

PENITENTIARY CANAL GREENBELT:

S. Koberg supplied an update on the Penitentiary Canal Greenbelt. The 404 permit application has been submitted. We are working on the purchase order for the wetland credits. The hope is to go to constructions as soon as possible. We are trying to keep the pathway open until we get to the construction time frame. We were made aware of a significant scallop under the Hwy 21 Bridge. It is now painted and coned off. ITD was contacted for a site visit. There are 2 inlets that failed and covered with debris. These will be adjusted and the pipe will be fixed. The closure of the pathway will occur on September 11th and will be closed for a week. A news release will go out on this. J. Grant inquired if the wetland credits being purchased are here in Idaho. S. Koberg responded that yes, but he was unsure of the exact area.

RED HAWK:

S. Koberg supplied an update on Red Hawk. He stated that he received additional input from Tim from the Hidden Springs perspective. He was asked to review some trail routes we were looking at to connect from Red Hawk to Avimor. He contacted Scott late last week and provided him with a map of a loop on Hidden Springs property that goes to Red Hawk property. The trail that Tim suggested adds

about 2 ¼ miles of trail off a loop of the existing Red Tail Trail. This makes good use of the Hidden Springs property and makes good use of key tie in points into Ada County property. Given the road improvements required if we are going to push the trailhead back, we need to focus on this trailhead connection.

NEW BUSINESS

E-BIKES

Representative Phylis King discussed her draft legislation for E-bikes. This was brought to her attention by a senior constituent who wanted to know where he could legally ride his electric bike. After looking in to it, it was discovered that there was nothing in the code regarding E-bikes and where they could be used. The draft legislation she has created is the first attempt to put something in the code. The language template came from People For Bikes out of Boulder, Colorado. The last 4-5 states that have enacted electric bike legislation have used this template.

On the first page are definitions of what e-bikes are. These are all 750 watt bikes. Class 1 is a pedal assist bike. This means that you need to be peddling in order for the motor to engage. This goes up to 20 MPH. Class 2 bike has a throttle. You can hit the throttle and it will go until you hit the brakes. This class also goes up to 20 MPH. Class 3 is the same as Class 1 except it goes up to 28 MPH. This class system will clarify what e-bike can go on what path/trail/Greenbelt.

Page 11 is language that is already in code. It says that an electric bike is a bicycle that can go wherever a bicycle can currently go. The same restrictions apply. An example would be a stop sign. You would be able to slow down, look both ways and proceed. Class 1 and Class 2 can do that. Class 3 needs to stop completely.

Page 9 is language that talks about driver's license. These bikes are a minimum of \$2500.00 and weigh 20-30 pounds. P. King thinks that mostly seniors will be riding these bikes and that some of them will not have drivers licenses. The thought is not to require a driver's license for this reason.

This language would be state law except if a city or county passes an ordinance that states differently. If the City of Boise or Ada County didn't want e-bikes on the Greenbelt, they would need to post signs that say so. C. Cook inquired if the signs will say which class of e-bike. P. King said that she hoped they would. But that they may say all electric bikes are considered motor vehicles and not allowed on the Greenbelt. BLM, Forrest Service and possibly State Parks and Recreation say that an electric bike is considered a vehicle and is not allowed on trails. They are only allowed on logging roads and graded highways. The state of Colorado got a waiver. If this legislation passes, we may be able to get a waiver from BLM, Forrest Service and State Parks & Recreation. J. Grant inquired if there is a definition for what is considered a path. P. King said that there was not, nor a trail. P. King has talked about that with the People For Bikes and her legislative services person. It has been left open for definition. P. King inquired if there should be a definition. J. Grant replied that yes, there needs to be a definition. P. King asked for a definition of a path or trail. J. Grant thought this would be a good discussion point for the Parks Board. J. Grant added that the National Parks and Recreation would have a path and trail definition and that she could track it down.

M. Basham added that COMPASS will be adopting a Pathway and Trail Plan in 2018. This includes trails, Greenbelt, Foothills Trails and anywhere there is a bike facility. This will be part of the Long Range Transportation Plan in 2018. M. Grubert added that his concern was with Greenbelt consistency. He went on to say that there are a lot of different sections. If you grant access next to Harris Ranch for e-bikes, how does the public know when they need to exit because they are entering the City of Boise? It creates confusion for the user. The parties went on to discuss city/county signage. P. King went on to say that she had received a notice that Boise Parks & Recreation plan to post speed limits on the Greenbelt for all riders. They hope to have their legislation done soon and enforcement before spring. They intend not to allow e-bikes in the Foothills. J. Grant inquired about the bikes people are buying that are electric where you can get aftermarket kits for more speed. P. King replied that there is a section on page 12 that addresses tampering restrictions. P. King went on to say that the city has not enforced any bike rules. They stop people but do not give out tickets.

Page 10 is language that talks about motorcycle, motorbike, UTV and ATV users having to wear helmets if they are under 18 years of age. This will be consistent with e-bikes. J. Grant inquired why it

is only until age 18. P. King responded that it is in code for motorcycle, motorbike, UTV and ATV users. M. Suderman expressed concern if an officer sees someone go through a stop sign and knowing what class the bike is. P. Kind responded that on page 11 of the legislation, there is a section about labeling requirements. Manufacturers will know that every bike will need to be labeled in a prominent location that will show the classification number, top assisted speed and motor wattage of the electric assisted bicycle and shall be printed in legible type.

The parties went on to discuss the use of e-bikes pedal power only versus turning the e-bike electricity on and using it that way and an additional complication it creates.

C. Cook added that the biggest things with this legislation is the path used by the class 1 and 2, similar on BLM or Forrest Service, there is a requirement that it has to be signed and mapped. Unless you require that sign to be placed at every entrance, it is confusing and unenforceable. He went on to say that the state, in section 49-730, should specifically call out that any path that is by ordinance bans e-bikes, it should be clearly signed at all entrances. Otherwise it could be confusing because there are so many jurisdictions.

J. Grant expressed her concern about people using e-bikes and possibly getting into some trouble such as being stranded because of a lack of electricity versus a person strictly using a pedal power bike.

D. McKinnon explained his experience with e-bikes and kits. A family member was able to purchase a kit to mount a battery and engine to the bike and get it to go 30 MPH. His concern is that there is nothing in the bill about modifying kits. P. King responded that this legislation is only addressing those bikes that are labeled and come from manufacturers that are class 1, 2 or 3. Anything other than that is not in the legislation. D. McKinnon pointed out that that the legislation says any person violating that section will be guilty of a misdemeanor. D. McKinnon inquired if kits were being outlawed. P. King responded that they are not trying to outlaw what is already out there. She just wants people to adhere to the labeling and laws the city puts out. D. McKinnon suggested kits should probably be addressed in this legislation. M. Grubert added that he agreed with David and that there is a concern with e-bikes being used on the Greenbelt because of the exploding technology and being able to keep some type of control.

The parties went on to discuss the age ranges of people that are using e-bikes and how they are being used.

K. Kostka expressed that she wasn't sure how there would be consistency when it comes to the labeling of e-bikes because of the amount of different kinds of bikes. She went on to say that she wasn't sure how any of this would be enforced. P. King said that she was struggling with bikes that were purchased prior to the legislation. K. Kostka mentioned the ability for municipalities to set their own rules for e-bikes if classifications can be set. It will allowed flexibility for local agencies. S. Koberg inquired as to the purposed of the legislation. Is it to define the bikes and where people can use them? P. King responded that yes that was the original intent and that this legislation has been passed in 4-5 other states. C. Cook added that signage is still important and clear to users.

P. King asked that questions and concerns be emailed to her.

K. Kostka is curious to see where this goes. She mentioned the motored skateboards downtown. M. Suderman commented that it's a slippery slope. How do you classify class 1, 2 and 3? We label them. But how do we see the label? We put on license plates. So now e-bikes are licensed? Then you will have a large amount of people that don't live in Ada County who think bicycles in general should be licensed. By licensing e-bikes it opens the door to licensing all bikes.

FOOTHILLS TRAILS APP

Deborah from Ada County IT updated everyone on the Foothills Trails App. IT is at the stage where they are drafting a project charter to define the project business case for Ada County building a Ridge to Rivers mobile application. The project charter is often where you determine whether you will move forward with the project or not. There is a lot of discussion about how this will be paid for, whether there is the bandwidth to build it, and if it will be used. If it will be used, then how many people do we need to use this app for it to be worth building. There are questions on how many people might actually choose to download the app to their phone given that there are numerous other apps already on the market. M. Grubert inquired if there will be a fee for the download. D. Fulkerson responded

that no, not that Ada County would charge. There may be a link to a Ridge to Rivers donation page. M. Suderman inquired how the other apps are updated when there are changes to trails. C. Cook responded that its user added. M. Suderman inquired if this app would be linked to the Ridge to Rivers online trail system? So that if a new trail is built and it is shown online, would it be shown on the app? D. Fulkerson responded that that was the idea. C. Cook added that he has used Trail Forks and MTB Project. Trail Forks automatically updates the trails as soon as someone rides it. As long as someone is using Strava, it gets an auto upload to Trail Forks. He went on to say the best thing for this app would be able to keep track of muddy trails and wet trails and know what trails are open at certain times of the year. M. Suderman inquired if MTB Project and Trail Forks recognize the gold rating from a couple years ago? Several members responded that no, it was not recognized. S. Koberg mentioned what would drive the download would be end user driven, not trail manager driven. K. Kostka added that if SWIMBA could be looped in on the app and be more specific on trails that would be helpful.

RIDGE TO RIVERS TRAIL RATINGS (SIGNAGE)

S. Koberg asked the group to look at the handout of the Foothills Challenge form a few years ago. This is in response to the group possibly contributing to Ridge to Rivers trail difficulty signage.

ADJOURNMENT

C. Cook adjourned the meeting at 1:34 p.m.