BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (BAC)

Meeting on September 22, 2026, 6:00 PM

BAC Members Present:	Connie Proctor, Chair Juan Contreras Juarez, Vice Chair Isaac Oyer Gainor Eisenlohr Alex Wohlbruck Matt Weschler Lauren Patterson Tammy Brock
BAC Members Absent:	Nate Steinhauer Andy Zou
City Staff and Guests Present:	Dave Campbell, CDOT Paola Bula Blanco, CDOT Paul Benton, CDOT Will Snyder, CRTPO Meg Fencil, Sustain Charlotte

DRAFT

Agenda Item #1 Call to Order

Connie Proctor called the meeting to order at 6:03 P.M.

Agenda Item #2 Introduction of Members and Guests

BAC members, CDOT staff, and guests introduced themselves. Public attendees included Eric Supil, Damian Smith, Ann, Randall, Hunter, and Joe.

Agenda Item #3 Approval of July and August 2026 meeting minutes

Connie made a motion to approve the July and August meeting minutes, seconded by Matt Weschler. All members present voted in favor. July and August meeting minutes were approved.

Agenda Item #4 Policy Subcommittee Update: Bicycle Parking Policy

Matt Weschler provided an update on the Policy Subcommittee's bicycle parking recommendations:

Initial recommendations have been shared with City staff and are currently under review. The subcommittee will likely continue the discussion with staff at an October meeting.

Agenda Item #5 Safety is No Accident Plan

Will Snyder, transportation planner with Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization (CRTPO), presented an overview of the Safety is No Accident Plan, a comprehensive safety action plan for the region.

Overview:

- CRTPO is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) responsible for federally mandated, long-range regional transportation planning across Mecklenburg, Iredell, and Union counties.
- More than 12 fatal or serious injury crashes occur each week within the CRTPO planning area.
- The plan uses the Safe System Approach (three E's: education, engagement, and enforcement) and builds on regional Vision Zero commitments.
- CRTPO received $3 million through the federal Safe Streets and Roads for All program in 2023 to develop the plan.
- The plan combines three primary sources to identify priority locations, creating a Prioritized Investment Network to guide future safety investments:
    - High Injury Network, based on crash history data
    - High Risk Network, based on roadway characteristics, surrounding land use, and demographic factors
    - Public input and lived experiences

Will shared several tools and research efforts supporting the plan:

- A CRASH Dashboard – staff can analyze factors including crash types, age range, vehicles involved, and weather to inform infrastructure decisions, from quick builds to larger improvement projects.

DRAFT

- Near-miss analysis will use temporary cameras at 20-30 intersections across the planning area. The cameras document user movements and potential conflict points to identify appropriate near-miss countermeasures. These could include re-timing signals and/or adding leading pedestrian intervals (LPIs). Each camera will be mounted to collect this data for three days.
- A Transportation Safety Task Force and Resident Advisory Group are part of the Planning Management Team to help guide plan development.
- CRTPO is currently in Phase 1 of public engagement, which includes a survey and social media campaign. Walk audits are planned for the spring, with a draft plan anticipated in early 2028.

Discussion:

- Connie asked whether the plan will provide guidance for quick-build projects. Will confirmed that a countermeasure toolkit will be developed and aligned with the UDO.
- Matt raised concerns about limitations in crash reporting. Will shared that the state recently updated the DMV crash reporting form to better distinguish bicyclists and other road users. Police department leadership will also receive training on how to correctly complete the new form.
- Hunter asked about expanding LPIs and pedestrian priority at signals. Will noted that the state is working toward LPIs at state-maintained signals, though implementation requires software changes that can take time. Charlotte maintains its own signals, with many existing LPIs concentrated closer to center city.

Agenda Item #6 High Speed Electric Motor Bikes

Dave shared that staff have researched approaches other cities are taking to address high-powered electric mobility devices. The Policy Subcommittee has also drafted a response to the City's recommendations, with the goal of developing BAC recommendations for City Council's consideration.

Matt provided background on the issue and draft recommendations:

- Recent concerns have focused on youth operating high-speed electric devices on streets and greenways.
- North Carolina law defines Class 1, 2, and 3 e-bikes and provides local jurisdictions with authority to establish regulations beginning December 1, 2026.
- Draft City recommendations address age restrictions, sidewalk riding, penalties related to injury or property damage, enforcement, and education.
- Members emphasized the distinction between legal Class 1–3 e-bikes and higher-powered devices commonly referred to as e-motos. Discussion noted that many

safety concerns are associated with these higher-speed devices that fall outside standard e-bike classifications.

Discussion

- Lauren expressed concern about broadly prohibiting sidewalk riding and emphasized clearly distinguishing sidewalks and shared-use paths.
- Meg expressed support for the BAC's feedback on the city attorney's draft and said Sustain Charlotte would be interested in sending along a letter of support to Council.
- Ann shared concerns about overregulation, particularly around sidewalk riding, helmet requirements, and youth restrictions, and how restrictions could interact with North Carolina's contributory negligence laws.
- Randall supported age restrictions for younger riders operating Class 2 and 3 e-bikes. Members mentioned that legal Class 1–3 e-bikes do not require registration, licensing, or insurance under state law.
- Hunter noted that shared micromobility devices, including Lime/Bird bikes, fall within these classifications and should be considered when developing age restrictions.
- Damian asked about establishing a definition for e-motos. Discussion noted that some higher-powered devices may already fall under state moped or motorcycle regulations and that misleading retail marketing remains an important education issue.
- Eric emphasized focusing regulation on unlawful high-powered devices rather than legal e-bikes and mentioned parent education as a priority.
- Gainor recommended developing clear educational materials explaining the differences between e-bikes and e-motos. Juan suggested distributing information directly to parents through PTAs, school newsletters, and both public and private schools.
- Connie raised questions about enforcement and whether devices could be easily identified.
- Members generally supported maintaining existing state helmet requirements rather than creating additional helmet regulations for Class 2 and 3 e-bikes.

Members reviewed the draft recommendations and identified edits, including additional emphasis on parent education and clarification of youth, sidewalk, and enforcement provisions.

Tammy made a motion to move the draft recommendations forward with the edits discussed during the meeting. A majority of members voted in favor, and the motion passed.

DRAFT

Agenda Item #7 Council Engagement

Members discussed upcoming opportunities to engage with City Council. The next public forum is September 28, 2026. There may also be opportunities to speak when relevant items are included on Council agendas.

Agenda Item #8 Confirm Next Meeting and Adjourn

Connie Proctor made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Juan Contreras Juarez. The meeting adjourned at 7:40 P.M.

The next BAC meeting is scheduled for Oct 20, 2026, at 6:00 P.M. at CMGC, Room 278.

DRAFT