

Summary of November 29, 2017 meeting

MTP Bicycle Element Working Group

Attendees:

Chris Slatt (Chair), Yvonne Norton (member), Lindsay Marfurt (member), Chips Johnson (member), Gillian Burgess (member), Nereide Ellis (member), Mike Hanna (member), Eric Goodman (member), Garrett Hennigan (guest); Alli Henry (staff), David Patton (staff), Erin Potter (staff), Henry Dunbar (staff), Ritch Viola (staff)

Agenda:

- 1) Public Comment – There was no public comment.

- 2) Review of November 20 Framework document draft- The working group reviewed the latest draft, starting with the policy statements.

There was interest in drafting a new Policy #1 pertaining to making physical improvements on streets to achieve more safety (Goal A). The policy statement should mention designing for safety of all users and that every street should be made safe for bicycling. Some of the existing implementation statements under other policies could be shifted to this section.

The policies under Goal B, need to be better defined to fit into three general categories regarding development of a low-stress bikeway network: 1) what, 2) where, and 3) how. Where – should include mention that every school, library, transit station, hospital should be on a low-stress route. How – need to mention community benefits from site plan developments including bike facilities, Private developers should be asked to upgrade existing bicycle facilities on site, build new facilities or reserve right-of-way for future improvements in places where bikeways are specified. Also need a statement that bicycle projects should be built both as a part of larger street projects and also as separate projects when a high priority.

Gillian recommended several additional implementation statements. They include encouraging and supporting bicycle races as a means to raise bicycling visibility, and creating guidelines for contractors to use when building near or in bikeways. Another policy recommendation is to add a statement that staff resources and expertise be developed for the proper design and upkeep of trails. Henry will work on some proposals regarding bike sharing equity and station location.

The working group also discussed some changes to the prioritization criteria, although a consensus on how to revise the draft was not achieved. One recommendation is to incorporate weighting for each of the criteria to help with scoring and ranking of each planned project. The DC and Montgomery County plans use three or four levels in ranking their projects. It was mentioned that Alta Consulting had developed a ranking system and had presented it to the Bicycle Advisory Committee in July 2015. Staff will investigate that system.

The working group also reviewed the materials that staff have developed for performance measures and targets. A handout was provided that listed many of the performance measurement statements in the peer cities' plans. Several suggestions from the working group include: provide baseline values at the time of the document's adoption and adding a target about staff (engineering and police) training regarding accommodating bicycles. The group debated some of the proposed dates and values that were in the draft document and requested staff to remove most of the values until further discussion could take place.

3) Discussion of the primary issues for the County Board work-session on December 5. Staff gave the working group an overview of the likely agenda for the work session. Staff is looking to gain a buy-in from the County Board on the general concepts in the draft framework as well as approval of the planning process. The main questions from staff to the Board will likely center around how to make choices amongst competing demands for streetspace and whether set criteria should be used in those determinations. The role of the planned bikeways maps in establishing approval of proposed projects should also be explored. Other items to raise with the Board include whether to pursue a Vision Zero policy and through what means to adopt it, and whether the framework policy should incorporate detailed studies and specifications or whether it would be better to provide more administrative flexibility for staff to use when making decisions.

4) The working group decided to not meet in December, but to instead try for two meetings in January. In addition to the regular fourth Thursday meeting day (January 25) staff will look for a meeting time in early January. A poll will be sent to members.