

Summary of January 25, 2018 meeting of the MTP Bicycle Element Update Working Group

Attendees: Chris Slatt (Chair), Gillian Burgess (member), Yvonne Norton (member), Chips Johnson (member), Lindsay Marfurt (member), Nereide Ellis (member), Eric Goodman (member); David Patton (staff), Alli Henry (staff), Erin Potter (staff), Henry Dunbar (staff), Shelley Peart (staff), Sergio Viricochea (staff), Kevin Casadei (staff), Ritch Viola (staff); Marcus Jolley (guest), Dan Simonson (guest), Kristy Vigrafson (guest), Rob Vigrafson (guest)

Introductions & Public Comment:

Kristy mentioned that she was very impressed with the thought and interest that has gone into the draft framework document. Dan agreed and asked about how he can provide additional feedback.

Review of Jan 18, 2018 Draft Framework Document:

Ritch spoke about the revisions to the draft Framework document that have been inputted over the past month. The January 18th edition includes a number of changes that were recommended by the Board and advisory commissions/committee in recent months. New language was highlighted yellow and revised language has blue highlighting.

Eric expressed that the draft does not provide a strong enough bicycling encouragement effort. Plan could be stronger in focusing resources in an equitable way.

Gillian would like more time to review and feels that the draft is not ready.

Yvonne spoke that she had watched the County Board's work session and wants to ensure that we define all the terms that the Board identified as needing clarification.

Chris would like all the capital project prioritization language to be contained in the Project Prioritization section. Identified statement in Policy 4 that should be revised.

Lindsay and Yvonne requested that we include a sheet or section for references with the framework document.

Gillian is looking for a section that lays out the expectations as to the recommended types of treatments based upon specific street types. The NACTO guidance was pointed out, but it is not clear that provides exactly what we want. Gillian also suggested that we adopt a name for bicycle lanes that do not have special treatments. Perhaps "Standard" or "Basic" is an appropriate descriptor.

Ritch spoke about potential changes for the Performance Measures section and relayed how the League of American Bicyclists' (LAB) criteria for evaluating Bicycle Friendly Communities might be applied. Fort Collins, CO has incorporated a subset of the LAB measures in their plan. They also used a similar style of presentation.

Chris commented that he feels Fort Collins picked solid measures and grouped them well. We might also want to include equity as a measure. Could use percent of population that has access to a Low Traffic Stress (LTS) route.

There was some discussion about targets for adults' participation in events. Would like to have a count of the number of individuals who participate in events hosted by Arlington County and by private groups. Tracking gender, age and other characteristics of participants could be helpful but may be hard to achieve. Eric asked how can we verify that we are reaching all of the communities that we want. What was suggested is to track percent of population served and the geographic areas as well.

Gillian would like to have measures that track Arlington police and engineering staff's training on bicycle matters. Also can we quantify the percentage of trips by County staff that are by bicycle. Possibly can track staff's use of Capital Bikeshare for work trips, otherwise not easy to get data on work travel.

Chips and Chris raised concerns about measures 10 and 3 respectively. May be too broad and could be affected by weather. Dockless bike share is also a matter of interest. County will need to obtain usage info from private companies such as how many bikes are in Arlington on a given day and they may not be willing to provide it.

David mentioned that measure #10 is currently used by Arlington DOT as one of its performance measures and would be easy to track using data produced from a set of permanent counters. He may work on a modeling component to work with the collected data.

Chris suggested revising #13 to reference the classification system for bicycle parking. Require Class 1 or 2 parking for employees and students. Eric would like to have a transportation survey every few years – could use the COG Household Travel survey as the device to capture the data.

Gillian suggested a measure that tracks the percentage of a school's attendance area that can be reached via a low-traffic-stress (LTS) route. Chips asked should we define all neighborhood streets as being LTS routes.

The group discussed whether to include measures that track aspects of the bicycling population, such as gender or age. Want to compare bicyclists against the demographics of Arlington as a whole. There is not consensus on tracking demographics.

Chris expressed that the approach to performance measures may be getting too detailed. Probably need to focus on only about a dozen measures. Make sure that we are tracking achievement of the plan's goals. We should ensure that each goal has at least one measure of performance. This could be something that could be addressed outside of the regular working group meetings. We should return to this at our next meeting.

Process for Phase 2 of Planning Effort:

Alli provided an overview and demonstration of the MetroQuest software that the County is looking to purchase. The product could be the primary engagement tool for Phase 2. The key elements of the software are the mapping feature and the ability to show photos of potential/examples projects for feedback. We are currently looking at how the software can relate to our GIS data/mapping system. We

could capture some demographic info. MetroQuest has flexibility in templates allowing for our customization.

Gillian expressed that have specific examples streets from Arlington would be helpful. Could ask questions like which is the best north south street for bicycling in Arlington.

Lindsay suggested that we work with our GIS staff to find out how the Google Maps in MetroQuest would work with our data and in what form the output would be.

We should focus on getting respondents to use the software to identify problems. Hopefully it will allow other respondents to Like or comment on prior comments. Our end goal is to develop a map of facility improvements. How can we identify what alternative routes there are for getting around difficult locations/streets.

Ritch provided a draft schedule for completing the plan update that has adoption in late 2018. Chris would like to have the MetroQuest survey plus two public workshops. One to go over bikeway barriers and gaps (April/May) a second (September) to discuss proposed facilities.

Gillian requested that we get more Arlington Pubic Schools involvement – possibly use HS and MS bike clubs, Phoenix Bikes and staff.

Kevin and Sergio presented some examples of specific bicycle facility designs that could be adopted with the plan. Some are intersection treatments that are not covered in detail within the NACTO guide. It may be valuable to get community feedback on the design concepts. However, we want to be careful not to overstate what we can deliver. Set reasonable expectations.

It was suggested that we try to identify general costs for different facility types. Some costs could vary considerably based upon the existing physical conditions of the street.