

## MEETING NOTES

### BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN SUBCOMMITTEE

**DATE:** Monday, September 26<sup>th</sup>, 2005

**TIME:** 1:00 P.M.

**PLACE:** COG, 777 North Capitol Street, NE  
First Floor, Room 1

**CHAIR:** Jim Sebastian,  
District Division of Transportation

**VICE-CHAIRS:** Charlie Denney  
Arlington County DPW  
Michael Jackson  
Maryland Department of Transportation

#### **Attendance:**

Fatemeh Allahdoust	VDOT/NOVA
Shaheer Assad	Loudoun County
Joshua Bennett	City of Alexandria
Michael Jackson	MDOT
Brian V. King	VDOT
Rich Metzinger	National Park Service
Allen Muchnick	Virginia Bicycling Federation
Mimi Murray	Fairfax County DOT
David Patton	VDOT
Carrie Sanders	City of Rockville
Jim Sebastian	District of Columbia
Fred Shaffer	M-NCPPC
Dennis Superczynski	Frederick County
Gail Tait-Nouri	Montgomery County DPWT
Maggie Thompson	WABA
Chris Wells	Fairfax County DOT
Maria White	City of Alexandria

#### **COG Staff Attendance:**

Andrew Austin

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee**  
**Notes from the September 26th, 2005 Meeting**  
Page 2

Michael Farrell  
Andrew Meese

**1. General Introductions.**

Participants introduced themselves.

**2. Review of the Minutes of the July 19<sup>th</sup>, 2005 Meeting**  
Michael Farrell, MWCOG

Minutes were approved.

**3. Status Report on the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Database and Plan**  
Andrew Austin, MWCOG, Michael Farrell, MWCOG

The subcommittee reviewed the latest draft of the regional bicycle and pedestrian plan. A meeting of the bike/ped plan work group was announced for Tuesday, October 18<sup>th</sup>. The subcommittee will have one last chance to comment on the draft bike/ped plan before it is presented to the TPB Technical Committee in December. Revisions to the database should be made no later than October 14<sup>th</sup> so that staff will have time to prepare a report for the bike/ped plan work group meeting on October 18<sup>th</sup>. Comments on the plan may be sent to Michael Farrell by e-mail, or by marking up the draft plan being distributed at this meeting.

The plan's timeline is the same as the CLRP's, to 2030. However, just as with the CLRP, not every project that will appear in the next thirty years is in it. Unlike the CLRP, the bike/ped plan project list is not financially constrained; agencies may submit as many projects as they wish. One way to think of it is as a build-out of everything currently being planned. We are not looking for projects that have already been completed, or for projects that do not yet exist, even in the planning phase. Just as with the CLRP, this plan will be updated in a few years and new projects can be added at that time.

Cost estimates are available for some projects but not for others. Cost should be cost for the entire project, not just a single year. Andrew Meese suggested that we look at what the financial consultant on the financial analysis for the CLRP has to say about the amount of spending on bicycle and pedestrian projects. A global estimate of cost can be derived from the estimated facility mileage. COG staff will multiply the regional facility mileage by an estimated cost per mile for each facility type. COG staff will not estimate individual project costs based on facility mileage, but COG staff will produce a regional total based on regional total facility mileage. Agencies should list a project cost estimate if one is available.

The bike/ped project list, as currently presented, is organized by

## **Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee Notes from the September 26th, 2005 Meeting**

Page 3

State/Agency/Jurisdiction/project listed alphabetically. There are other ways it could be organized. The lead agency is the agency with primary responsibility for executing the project; not necessarily the agency providing the funding. The jurisdiction is a geographical expression, not the government agency with the same name. For example, we include the City of Alexandria as both an agency and as a jurisdiction.

The database was demonstrated. An error occurred on September 13<sup>th</sup> which caused some of the data to be lost. If a lot of data was lost, we may be able to get back-ups from our web hosting company.

Not every data category needs to be completed – some, like project manager name, etc., are good to know but not critical. The data categories shown in the report should be completed, especially the estimated facility mileage, which is necessary to estimate the total regional cost. Some elements, such as whether the project is in the CLRP and TIP, we can determine ourselves. You can add and delete records. Always hit update or your changes won't save. Enter your agency from the pull-down menu, or it won't show up in the database. When you cut and paste, try to avoid cutting and pasting things like commas, because it will cause the database to sort your project improperly.

There were some questions on formatting and names of jurisdictions and agencies in the report. At the next meeting we will bring in several different possible versions of formatting and the group can decide which works best. The projects could be sorted by jurisdiction rather than by primary agency. Jim Sebastian moved that further discussion on the design of the report be deferred to the meeting on October 18<sup>th</sup>.

Michael Jackson suggested that the report include a table of contents.

The schedule for review of the plan is as follows:

- October 14<sup>th</sup> - projects to be entered into the database, comments on this version of the plan to be submitted to Michael Farrell
- October 18<sup>th</sup> - the next version of the bike/ped plan and project report to be reviewed by the Bike/Ped Plan Work Group.
- November 15<sup>th</sup> – the bike/ped subcommittee will approve a draft of the plan to be presented to the TPB Technical Committee
- December 2<sup>nd</sup> – COG staff will present a draft of the bike/ped plan to the TPB Technical Committee

#### **4. New Regional Unfunded Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority List**

Michael Farrell, MWCOG

It was agreed to defer any adoption of a priority list this year. The Transportation Planning Board should see the new bicycle and pedestrian plan project list before seeing a top priority list.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee**  
**Notes from the September 26th, 2005 Meeting**

Page 4

Michael Farrell suggested that he could produce an update on what happened to last year's top ten list, but Jim Sebastian suggested that the correct time to produce a progress report on the last list is the time when we propose another list. If we decide to produce another regional priority unfunded bicycle and pedestrian project list it will likely be in September, 2006.

Andrew Meese suggested that in the plan, rather than showing the most recent unfunded list, that we show projects that were in past lists and have gone on to be funded. A number of projects from last year's list have been funded.

- No regional priority unfunded project list will be selected this year
- The results for projects in past lists will be included in the bicycle/pedestrian plan

**5. Street Smart 2006 Funding Status**

Michael Farrell, MWCOG

In accordance with TPB's directives, COG is going to send out a letter to the CAO's of all the TPB member jurisdictions, providing everyone with an opportunity to contribute funds to this program. A table showing the suggested level of contribution for each jurisdiction of five cents per capita was distributed. Every TPB member government will now be made aware that this program exists, that it is seeking funding, and that they have an opportunity to contribute. If all TPB member governments contributed at a level of five cents per capita, a total of \$207,000 would be raised.

COG has also applied for federal funds through the States. We have received \$50,000 from the Maryland Office of Highway Safety and \$100,000 from the Virginia DMV. The District of Columbia will probably contribute \$100,000 again, but we have received no official word.

Maria Mercedes-White asked if the April resolution was not an agreement to contribute funds. Michael Farrell replied that it was not a commitment to provide funds; it was a commitment by the TPB to send letters to its member jurisdictions requesting funds. The contributions are to be voluntary. This letter is helpful because it is an official request addressed to the highest level, to which COG staff can refer when soliciting funds for this program. It also provides a schedule and a suggested funding level for contributions to the program. Andrew Meese added that there had been considerable thought about making this program a part of the COG dues, and that it had been decided that it should be kept on a voluntary basis. The letters will go out shortly.

Contracts must be signed with the States by November 1<sup>st</sup>, so official commitments of local funds are needed by then. The match level is 20%.

No action is required from the bike/ped subcommittee. Michael Farrell will bring a copy of the letter to the next meeting of the bike/ped subcommittee.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee**  
**Notes from the September 26th, 2005 Meeting**  
Page 5

Since COG already has a contractor on board for Street Smart, we should be able to start work in December, and have plenty of time to review the campaign content before running the campaign, most likely in April.

No final report is available for 2005 yet, but we did a great job this year coordinating with law enforcement. We gave away more than 50,000 safety cards, which many law enforcement agencies used for pedestrian-related enforcement. We expect to improve on that performance next year

The City of Alexandria has already contributed for 2006. Fairfax County will probably contribute for the 2006 campaign. Chris Wells announced that Fairfax County intended to contribute \$50,000 in 2006, but suggested that more jurisdictions contribute. Per-capita seems like a fair basis for distributing the burden. If Fairfax were not able to contribute, and other major jurisdictions do not contribute, the program could not continue.

- Commitments for local contributions for the Street Smart program are needed by November 1st

6. **SAFETEA-LU Bicycle and Pedestrian Provisions**  
Michael Farrell, MWCOG

Michael Farrell spoke to a powerpoint discussing the new SAFETEA-LU transportation bill. The new bill provides covers the period 2005-2009, and establishes planning requirements for the TPB as the MPO. It increases funding by 22% compared to the previous bill. The law was signed in August, so people are still reading it, figuring out what it means. It will take some time to produce new regulations based on the bill. Funds for planning are increased from 1% of the total to 1.25% of the total. So the likely result is more planning money coming COG's way.

Safety and security are now separate planning factors. The bill has a lot of language calling for consulting and coordination, but not too many hard mandates. The plan and the TIP must now be updated every four years, instead of three and two respectively. Bicyclists, pedestrians, and people with disabilities shall be provided with opportunities to comment on the plan.

The biggest new bicycle and pedestrian program is the Safe Routes to School Program. The goal of the program is to encourage children to walk and bicycle to school. The program funds must be spent for both soft and hard infrastructure programs. Education and encouragement are eligible categories, so Safe Routes to School funds could potentially be used for the Street Smart program. The funds will be administered by the States. Safe Routes to School funds are 100% federal, with no local match required.

Bicycle and Pedestrian projects are eligible for Highway Safety funds, which require only a 10% local match.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee**  
**Notes from the September 26th, 2005 Meeting**  
Page 6

Bicyclists and motorcyclists are required to be able to use HOT (High Occupancy Toll) lanes for free, although States may request an exemption based on safety.

Safe Routes to School is especially timely, given that rising gasoline costs are making it increasingly expensive to bus children to school.

**7. FY 2007 Unified Planning Work Program**

- UPWP Bicycle and Pedestrian Element

Copies of the current 2006 Bicycle and Pedestrian Element of the Unified Planning Work Program were distributed.

There are three broad categories of activities in the UPWP for bicycling and walking. The first is planning – the bicycle and pedestrian plan and the constrained long-range plan. The second is regional technical analytical support and information. And the third is public outreach, education, and training.

Once the bicycle and pedestrian plan is finished, we can step up the latter two activities. A technical activity that might be undertaken is an update of the regional GIS layer of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Given that more planning funds may become available in 2007, and that more staff time will be available when the bicycle and pedestrian plan is finished, we are looking for the subcommittee's ideas on technical support and training and education activities that could be undertaken.

Allen Muchnick suggested that a Bicycle Level of Service analysis on the roads could be done for the region. Since much of the work has already been done by the States, perhaps COG could do a compilation. Michael Jackson suggested that Michael Farrell try to ensure that bicycling and walking are included in access to jobs planning. We currently have one workshop per year in the work program, but generally we have done two per year. Safe Routes to School would be a good topic for a training workshop.

The 2007 UPWP will be drafted within a few months, so subcommittee members should think about activities they would like included, and contact Michael Farrell.

Jim Sebastian suggested that if a budget increase were likely, that the bicycle/pedestrian program be expanded to a full-time equivalent, not all of which would have to be Michael Farrell's time.

Fatemeh Allahdoust suggested that the subcommittee deal more with disabilities. COG already has a committee that deals with disabilities, called Access for All, which is likely to become a permanent committee. Jim Sebastian suggested that we find more ways to cross-pollinate with

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee**  
**Notes from the September 26th, 2005 Meeting**  
Page 7

that subcommittee.

- New Household Travel Survey.

A letter was distributed from Jim Sebastian on behalf of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee to the Chair of the TPB Technical Committee, supporting a new household travel survey with a larger sample size, to provide reliable information on bicycle and pedestrian mode share at the jurisdictional level. The letter also called for better public access to the data, through a web site or report. The last large travel survey was done in 1994. Jurisdictional mode share is a performance measure for bicycle and pedestrian coordinators such as Jim Sebastian. Chris Wells agreed that a better survey was needed. Fairfax County is spending millions on pedestrian facilities, and accurate mode shares for pedestrians are needed to justify those expenditures. The census data only covers work trips; we need to know about non-work trips.

Jim Sebastian asked the subcommittee to approve the letter to the TPB Technical Committee, and offered to attend a Tech Committee meeting to discuss the letter. Andrew Meese agreed that that would be the best course of action.

- At the next meeting a list of proposals for regional technical analytical support and education and outreach activities will be considered for possible inclusion in the bicycle and pedestrian element of the 2007 Unified Planning Work Program. Subcommittee members are encouraged to submit suggestions.
- Jim Sebastian will send a letter to the TPB Technical Committee supporting the inclusion of a new major household travel survey in the UPWP.

8. **Discuss Findings of the Bike Parking Management Work Group**  
Michael Jackson, MDOT

The bicycle parking management work group was formed last September in response to a report that WMATA prepared showing the distribution of bike lockers among rail stations. The group examined conditions at several rail stations. The group proposed re-distributing the existing lockers, improving marketing, and adding bicycle route signage nearby, as well as better information in the station on bicycle parking. In most cases moving lockers is too expensive relative to adding new ones, especially if the lockers are in poor condition.

WMATA has lost the person who was renting bicycle lockers, and customers seeking to rent lockers recently have not been able to do so.

Jim Sebastian noted that it would be useful to have a bicycle/pedestrian coordinator at WMATA. Without one, it is very unlikely that any recommendations of ours will be acted upon.

Andrew Meese suggested that, from the point of view of protocol, the subcommittee has two

## **Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee Notes from the September 26th, 2005 Meeting**

Page 8

courses of action available. One would be to take our recommendations to the TPB Technical Committee. Another additional or alternative route would be for the jurisdictional staff work through their own jurisdiction's representative on the WMATA Board. The subcommittee should not send a letter to WMATA; we would have to get approval by the TPB Technical Committee, and ultimately by the TPB.

The letter should probably be re-written to call attention to the need for more staffing resources and attention to bicycle access at WMATA, rather than the specific recommendations at the stations that the bike parking work group examined.

Allen Muchnick argued that since the mode share of access by bicycle to WMATA is very low, the potential for growth is high. New bicycle riders are likely either not driving, a savings for WMATA on automobile parking, or new riders.

We need to make our recommendations specific, in terms of telling WMATA exactly what we want them to do. Chris Wells added that the maintenance and the marketing of the facilities have been on-going challenges.

Andrew Meese suggested that the letter suggest that WMATA assign a full-time staff person to deal with pedestrian and bicycle access, list the types of topics that this person would deal with, and give a few specific examples of conditions found at specific Metro stations such as Southern Avenue, just by way of example. Tie the staffing to the specific issues need to be dealt with. We could recommend using this subcommittee as a resource for technical coordination and advice to WMATA. Jim Sebastian agreed that we need to make this letter a broad letter discussing the issues that need to be addressed, and proposing that a full-time staff person be assigned at WMATA to deal with them. That letter would go the TPB Technical Committee, and from there to WMATA's Jurisdictional Coordinating Committee. It would follow up on the request we made a year and a half ago to the JCC for a bicycle and pedestrian coordinator at WMATA. No WMATA representative has been present at recent meetings of this subcommittee. WMATA has not been studying bike on bus use. Little or no progress has been made on staffing or on the substantive issues that the members of the bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee would like to see addressed. Jim Sebastian suggested that station-area improvements would likely have to be paid for by the jurisdictions. The New York Avenue Metro Station was paid for by the District of Columbia and by property-owners. However, even if the jurisdictions want to pay they still need someone to work with at WMATA.

Michael Jackson suggested that we work with Jim Sebastian to prepare a letter, as well as consulting with MDOT's WMATA representative. Michael Farrell offered to gather the facts on the last request we made to the JCC, and the outcome of that request.

- COG staff will work with Jim Sebastian and Michael Jackson to draft a letter to WMATA's Jurisdictional Coordinating Committee, to be reviewed by the TPB Technial



**Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee**  
**Notes from the September 26th, 2005 Meeting**  
Page 9

Committee, asking WMATA to assign a full-time bicycle and pedestrian coordinator, and describing the issues that person would address.

9. **Jurisdictional Updates**

Christy Huddle is leaving Montgomery County, so her position is vacant. Montgomery County will be recruiting a replacement.

Michael Jackson is meeting with the Frederick Pedalers and the Frederick City Commissioners concerning marking shoulders as bicycle routes. On October 5<sup>th</sup> they will be doing a bike ride to look at the proposed routes in the City of Frederick.

**Adjourned.**