National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board

777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20002-4290 (202) 962-3310 Fax: (202) 962-3202 TDD: (202) 962-3213

MEETING NOTES

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN SUBCOMMITTEE

DATE: Tuesday, January 31st, 2017

TIME: 1:00 P.M.

PLACE: Room 1, First Floor
777 North Capitol Street NE
Washington, DC 20002

CHAIR: Karyn C. McAlister, Prince George's DPWT

VICE-CHAIRS:
David Goodman, Arlington Department of Environmental Services
Jeff Dunckel, Montgomery County Department of Transportation
Jamie Carrington, WMATA
Jim Sebastian, DDOT

Attendance:

David Anspacher	Montgomery County Planning
James Carrington	WMATA
Jeff Ciabotti	Toole Design (by phone)
Cindy Engelhart	VDOT
Steve Friedman	Montgomery County (by phone)
David Goodman	Arlington DES
Mike Goodno	DDOT
Ray Hayhurst	City of Alexandria
Rahul Jain	DDOT
Adam Lind	Fairfax County (by phone)
David Patton	Arlington County
Oleg Kotov	City of Rockville
Karyn McAlister	Prince George's County DPWT
Marieannette Otero	Safe Routes to School Regional Partnership
Jon Ryder	Montgomery County Planning

Molla Sarros	Maryland Department of the Environment (by phone)
Debbie Spiliotopoulos	Northern Virginia Regional Commission
Stephen Tu	Montgomery County Planning
Victor Weisberg	Prince George's DPWT (by phone)
John Wetmore	Pedestrians.org

COG Staff Attendance:

Lamont Cobb
Michael Farrell
Ken Joh
Andrew Meese
Jessica Mirr
Jon Schermann

1. **General Introductions.**

Ms. McAlister chaired the meeting.

2. **Review of the November 15th Meeting Notes**

Meeting notes were approved.

3. **Jurisdictional Updates**

4. **2017-2018 Regional Household Travel Survey**

Mr. Tu spoke to a powerpoint.

The last survey of 11,000 households was in 2007-2008. The upcoming survey will include 15,000 households. Robert Griffiths will be a senior advisor to the project, and Richard Roisman will be the project manager. Ron Milone will be the lead modeler. The survey contractor is Resource Systems Group, which is based in Vermont, though they have an Arlington office. RSG will use a web-based (RSurvey) and smart phone app (RMove) survey.

Before the main survey there will be a pre-test of 800 households, which will allow adjustments. This will include 400 smart phone GPS app surveys. The survey will collect detailed sociodemographic information from a representative sample of households in the region. The survey will consist of a one day travel diary with a GPS component.

Ms. Engelhart said that viruses are a concern when responding to on-line surveys. That may affect response rates. Clicking on a link can be hazardous. COG will reach out by mail in advance to help allay such concerns. There is a paper option for people who prefer not to go on line. With non-telephone interviews you tend to get more honest responses.

COG uses a large area to model travel demand, including a portion of West Virginia. The sampling area will include both high and low-density areas, with over-sampling in high density mixed use areas, to help capture multimodal transportation options such as transit, walk, and bike.

Lower income households and racial and ethnic minorities usually respond at a lower rate, so the plan incorporates an outreach effort. There will be financial incentives for completing the survey, with a higher incentive for lower income households. There is a $20 gift card for using the smart phone app. Everyone gets the gift card who completes the survey.

The survey will kick off in September. There will be questions about HOV, toll lanes, Uber, Lyft, and bikeshare. Mr. Austin asked if Car2Go was included. Mr. Joh replied that Car2Go and Zipcar would be included.

Part one of the survey will be respondent sociodemographic characteristics. Part two is the one-day travel diary.

This is a major effort by COG, so we are partnering with the DOT's and WMATA to use their logos on the survey, as well as VDRPT's logo.

Ms. Engelhart asked if there was a question about electric vehicles. Mr. Joh replied that there would be such a question.

One of the benefits of the survey is that it captures non-work travel. There will be many questions relating to multimodal travel. The Census asks about work trips. Our survey will ask about secondary modes of travel for work trips, such as the means of access or egress from transit. So transit/walk/bike connections will be captured. The survey will be conducted over a 12 month period, and households will be assigned a particular travel day. Not everyone will have the same travel day. Ms. Engelhart asked about the phrasing for a typical week. The exact working of the questions can still be adjusted.

The survey instrument is still being finalized. When will this committee have an opportunity to comment. The pretest questions are already determined. Ms. Engelhart expressed interest in reviewing the survey. Mr. Joh promised that the Subcommittee will be able to review the final survey.

Ms. Engelhart asked how many access modes could be cited. Mr. Joh said that it would be "check all that apply". Mr. Farrell asked at what geographic level we will get valid data for walk and bike modes. Mr. Joh replied that the data may not be valid at the local level, especially for bicycle travel. Mr. Goodman asked if it would be possible for jurisdictions to pay for additional over-sampling. Mr. Joh replied that it was possible. Mr. Goodman asked to be advised of what that would entail, since his department might be interested.

Capital Bikeshare use will be surveyed, but there are other bike share systems such as Zagster.

Typical bike use per week is asked, as well as whether the work place offers incentives and bike parking. Similar questions were asked in 2007. Typical bike share trips per week and access and ingress mode to transit are new questions.

The pretest will be conducted in February. It will cover four weeks. Notice cards will be sent out in advance, for both the paper and the smartphone app. The pretest will be finished by the end of March. The main survey will be launched in July. Safetrack may affect responses, so we are trying to avoid Safetrack, which should be complete by the end of June. The survey will be completed by early next summer.

The survey will include both work and nonwork trips. Mr. Goodman asked when could look at the survey. Mr. Joh said that the pretest couldn't be changed at this point, but the final survey instrument should be available before the March 21st Subcommittee meeting.

5. New Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Database

Mr. Austin demonstrated the new bicycle and pedestrian project database. This has been a long-awaited product. The database is the basis for the bicycle and pedestrian plan. We are slightly behind schedule for an update of that the database. The new database will use the same architecture as the CLRP and the TIP, and it will offer some useful features. The current version is a draft, but if should be ready for use soon.

The old database was put together in-house, by Mr. Austin. It lacked an individual log-in and date and time stamps. Now that the new web site it up, the contractor, American Eagle, has been able turn its attention to this. It has a few test records in it. When you log in you will be able to see your agency's projects. The fields are largely the same as before. There will be a COG project ID for each project.

The jurisdiction field will be a multiselect for multijurisdictional projects. The lead agency is the agency carrying out the project. Ms. Engelhart suggested using "location jurisdiction" and "implementing agency" or "lead agency" to make it clear. There is only one lead agency per project.

Mr. Goodman asked about costs. Do we care about identified funding? Mr. Farrell replied that there was a "Status" menu to show whether projects were unfunded, partially funded, fully funded, under construction, or complete. We could add a box to show the amount. And another for funding sources? Who is the audience for the list?

Mr. Farrell replied that the TPB is the audience for the list. This list is meant to include all the major projects in all the plans in the region, with basic information on each project. We can add all this information up to get a big picture of what is being planned the region, and over time, what is being done. How many miles of bike lanes are being planned? What has been completed, and in what year? Etc. This information will be searchable, by us, and by the public.

We may not want to get too far down into details such as how much funding and the source. Most of these projects have not even been designed, so we don't have an estimated cost. It should be labelled "estimated cost", not "cost". Exact cost is more information than we need. We're trying to reduce the pain factor. If a project has a corresponding listing in the TIP, all the funding information is there. We'll show which projects have a TIP ID, so you can get more funding detail if you need it.

In principle if you filled out all the information in this database, you could use it to rank projects by how many prioritization factors they address.

Complete projects stay on the list, because we need to show the history. You can easily filter out the completed projects to get a list of planned projects. As projects are implemented in parts, they split into multiple projects.

Ms. Engelhart suggested using the AASHTO term, shared-use path, not multi-use path.

We could add more categories of project such as bike share.

With bike lanes we had been using center line miles rather than lane miles. The box should be clearer, label it center line miles and lane miles. But that could leave us with an apples to oranges problem between old and new. With sidewalks center line miles makes no sense. Mr. Farrell said that we don't always have length of sidewalk. We could specify curb miles of sidewalk.

The only real filter on these projects is size. So with sidewalks I typically asked for a jurisdictional sidewalk program, so the number of miles of sidewalk added per year, not a series of tiny projects. Size, in miles or cost, is the only filter. This is meant to be a 30,000 foot view of things. That doesn't capture whether important missing links have been filled. Mr. Farrell said that measuring network sensitivity, for this purpose, was probably beyond us. If you think a project is important for the network, you can put it in. You don't have to adhere to the guidelines.

Mr. Goodman said that Arlington is focused on piggybacking on resurfacing. Mr. Farrell noted that there is a check box for whether the project is part of a larger project. If you're getting bike lanes out of an annual repaving program, you can put in “annual repaving program” and the number of lanes added per year. You can explain special circumstances in the project description.

Ms. Engelhart suggested using linear miles for sidewalk and path.

We don’t track sharrows or shared streets. We don’t track mileage of signed routes; they are not counted as a facility.

Should cycle tracks be considered as being on or adjacent to an existing roadway. Ms. Engelhart said that most of them are on. And we should include buffered bike lanes. Cycle tracks are currently being counted as bike lanes, but we may want to call them out as their own category. They’re new enough that we had not been doing that. “Protected bike lanes” is the current nomenclature. As two-way facility types they are distinct. So we can add a box for “protected bike lanes”, and “buffered bike lane” where it’s just a paint buffer.

The yes/no questions at the bottom reflect the selection factors for the priority unfunded projects. In a regional activity center, connects regional activity centers, access to transit, reconstruction (an information item). We can drop the category of whether it’s in the top priority unfunded list. There are not a lot of projects on that list. And it creates consistency issues when the top priority list changes. There’s only 15 of these projects.

A transit facility is defined as a rail station or a transit center. A BRT station would also count, as would a transit center where a number of bus lines come together. That’s a bit of a judgement call. In the case of a park and ride lot, if it’s just one route, or a commuter bus, then that’s not a big enough generator. We want to serve places that generate a lot of ridership. The common underlying theme is “do you get a lot of traffic”.

Mr. Austin asked for suggestions on search terms.

If a project is in an agency capital improvement program, or an agency budget, it can be added. As long as you’re getting bicycle or pedestrian projects out of it, it doesn’t matter whether it’s in the capital budget or the maintenance budget.

Ms. McAlister asked about GIS, whether we would get a map of these projects. Mr. Austin replied that we do have a GIS layer of the bicycle and pedestrian database, which have been mapped to the extent that they are mappable. The GIS will not be visible on the agency interface, but when we get to the publicly viewable element we will have some sort of map.

Projects such as countywide sidewalk upgrades are not really mappable – we just show a point in the jurisdiction.

6. Capital Trails Coalition

The Capital Trails Coalition is working to create a regional trails plan.

The analytics working group of the coalition. is developing a regional map of existing and planned trails, using agency GIS data. Rails to Trails is developing a web based trail planning map portal for the region. They will be visiting the agencies to hold work sessions to gather that data. Your participation in the Coalition is welcome.

Mr. Farrell noted that the GIS data that COG has from the jurisdictions is out of date, so we are hoping to piggyback on this Rails to Trails effort to get the latest GIS data, which we can use to create a new regional bike map. Commuter Connections has some interest in funding the printing and production of that map, which would be distributed for free.

The Kappa Maps proposal is looking less interesting because they don't have a product.

Ms. Harris said that the CTC is focused on trails. Kelly Pack from RTC will be reaching out to all the jurisdictions that have not yet been contacted.

7. Announcements and Other Business

The Transportation Land Use Connections program will soon be requesting applications for funding. If you are local member jurisdiction you may apply; if not you must partner with one. Funding is available up through 30% design, but not for more than that due to funding constraints, no more than $80,000 per application, for consultant support.

The consultant works for the grantee. Projects that look at equity and diversity are welcome.

Ms. McAlister asked if low stress networks could be funded. Mr. Lamont replied that they could be. An independent panel selects the projects. Applications are due by April 3rd.

COG also has a partnership with Urban Land Institute for development proposals. The flyer has the details.

The next Street Smart campaign will take place in the Spring. There will be an advisory group meeting shortly. We still don't have a funding contract with DDOT for the Spring campaign.

The next meeting will be on Tuesday, March 21st at 1 p.m. in Room 3.

8. Adjourned