

# 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, May 20, 2014

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

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

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

**VICE-  
CHAIRS:**

David Goodman – Arlington Department of Environmental Services  
Jeff Dunckel, Montgomery County Department of Transportation  
Kristin Haldeman, WMATA  
Carrie Sanders, Alexandria Department of Transportation and  
Environmental Services  
Fred Shaffer, M-NCPPC, Prince George's County

**Attendance:**

Michael Alvino	National Park Service
Jeff Dunckel	Montgomery County DOT
Chris Eatough	BikeArlington
Cindy Engelhart	VDOT- Northern Virginia
David Goodman	Arlington DES
Collen Hawkinson	DDOT
Michael Jackson	MDOT
Philip Koopman	BicyclePASS
Dan Malouff	Arlington
David Patton	Arlington DES
George Phillips	Prince William County (by phone)
Jim Sebastian	DDOT

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee**  
**Notes from the May 20th, 2014 Meeting**  
Page 2

Patricia Shepherd	Montgomery County DOT
Gail Tait-Nouri	WMATA
Debbie Spiliotopoulos	Northern Virginia Regional Commission
Charlie Strunk	Fairfax County DOT
Chris Wells	Fairfax County DOT
John Wetmore	Perils for Pedestrians

**COG Staff Attendance:**

Michael Farrell  
Andrew Meese  
Marco Trigueros

**1. General Introductions.**

Participants introduced themselves. Call in number is not working.

**2. Review of the March 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes**

Minutes were approved. Mr. Farrell asked members to check the attendance roster, since not everyone signed the sign-in sheet for this meeting.

**3. Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements of MoveDC**

Ms. Hawkinson spoke to a powerpoint. The draft will be released any day now.

MoveDC is the federally mandated statewide vision plan. This initiative was kicked off in February of 2013. The previous one dates from 1997.

Outside the mandated vision plan, it is also a local transportation plan. It deprioritizes some corridors that were prioritized for multiple modes at the same time.

There was an extensive public outreach component. There was an interactive component that allowed people to balance different priorities.

The outcome will be improved multimodal access, better maintenance, and support for anticipated growth.

The plan period is to 2040. It proposes 22 miles of streetcars, plus “high capacity transit” corridors, numerous trails, and managed access to downtown.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee**  
**Notes from the May 20th, 2014 Meeting**  
Page 3

Different corridors will have different modal priorities. Pedestrians should be accommodated everywhere they are permitted. Each street should accommodate pedestrians, vehicles, and something else, such as bikes, transit, or freight.

Sidewalk provision is prioritized based on a number of factors.

There will be no freestanding bicycle or pedestrian plans, instead there will be the pedestrian and bicycle elements of MoveDC. MoveDC strives to make consistent, feasible recommendations. Not every street can accommodate every mode equally well.

The plan will use bicycle level of service to prioritize bicycle improvements.

Next steps include release of a draft plan, and a public comment period through the end of June. There will be an on-line feedback form. DDOT will then try to get as many of the Tier One projects as possible into the TIP and CLRP.

Mr. Jackson asked the 75% alternate mode split, about Western, Eastern, and Southern Avenues.

Ms. Hawkinson replied that Sustainable DC set the 75% alternate (non SOV) commuter mode split goal. If everything in MoveDC is implemented, DC will get to 65%. Getting to 75% would require tolling additional routes not currently proposed for tolls, such as Connecticut Avenue and Massachusetts Avenue, and increasing the cordon toll around downtown. The number could also improve based on decisions by other jurisdictions.

Mr. Sebastian explained that there wasn't much interest in bike facilities on Western, Eastern, and Southern Avenues. Those routes are hilly, and don't have that many major destinations. These roads are all forty feet wide, and putting in bike lanes would require taking out parking or a travel lane. Ms. Hawkinson added that there would be routes available parallel to those routes, such as Nebraska and South Dakota avenues.

Decisions regarding exemptions from tolls have not been made yet, but the goal would be to reduce single occupant vehicles entering the District at peak hours.

Mr. Eatough asked if there had been a lot of negative feedback on the proposed bicycle facilities. Ms. Hawkinson said that there was not, but that people typically advocated for the travel mode that they usually used.

As these projects approach implementation, trade-offs will have to be made. Some projects have already been eliminated, such as the Rhode Island Avenue bike lane. Mr. Sebastian said that opposition typically appears during the implementation, not the planning phase. It's not real enough yet.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee**  
**Notes from the May 20th, 2014 Meeting**  
Page 4

The plan includes the Long Bridge railroad study, which would include a bicycle and pedestrian path. The bridge is owned by CSX. Mr. Wetmore asked if CSX was opposed. Mr. Sebastian replied that they were not necessarily opposed; it was more about who would pay. Mr. Wells added that the project would benefit both commuter rail and freight by increasing the number of trains that the bridge can handle. So there is likely to be some public money made available.

Ms. Engelhart asked if the bridge to Theodore Roosevelt Island was included in MoveDC. Ms. Hawkinson said that it was not, though it is in the Georgetown BID's plan. Mr. Sebastian said that it can still be done, even if it's not in MoveDC. Ms. Engelhart asked why it wasn't in MoveDC. Ms. Hawkinson said that DDOT could support such a bridge. Mr. Jackson asked about ferry service. Ms. Engelhard said that there may not be the draft clearance to allow a ferry to dock at all times of the year, especially on TR island.

Mr. Phillips asked about the inclusion of Bicycle Level of Service. Mr. Sebastian said that it had been included in the 2005 bicycle plan, so it was a good yardstick for evaluating the system and measuring progress.

More information is available at [wemovdedc.org](http://wemovdedc.org).

#### **4. Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan**

Mr. Farrell spoke to a powerpoint.

We update the bike/ped plan every four years. The most recent one was adopted in October 2010. The FY 2014 Unified Planning Work Program calls for an updated bicycle and pedestrian plan.

The meat of the plan is the database of bicycle and pedestrian projects. It tells us what we have planned for the next 25 years, and also, what has been accomplished since 2010. DDOT is a must have agency. Mr. Sebastian agreed to enter DDOT's projects.

Mr. Wells said that Fairfax has 144 existing projects and 126 new ones, and asked about a deadline. Mr. Farrell said he needed it by the end of May. You don't have to enter all the projects, just the major ones. The major take-away is the mileage of facilities planned. Mr. Farrell said that a round-number estimate would be fine. The cut-off can be one mile, or \$250,000, or higher than that if you like. We're trying to get a 30,000 foot overview of what we have planned for the next 25 years. Last time we estimated that we had \$1 billion worth of projects – we don't need precise cost estimates at the project level.

If you have a project that is already in the database, but that has been finished, just change the status to "Complete" so I can report it as complete.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee**  
**Notes from the May 20th, 2014 Meeting**  
Page 5

We are keeping the same outline as 2010 but updating it for new information. At the TPB level, the major change is the adoption of the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan. It doesn't change the goals of the TPB Vision, but it explains how those goals are complementary.

At the federal level, we have MAP-21 and the Transportation Alternatives program. MAP-21 is expiring soon, and we don't know what will replace it.

We have Complete Streets policies at the regional, state, and local level, notably in Maryland which has strengthened its Complete Streets. Complete Streets is very significant in that projects are always being built, and if you include bicycle and pedestrian facilities all or most of the time, you build a lot of projects.

The proportion of funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects has doubled, from 1% to 2% of the total. We will also document local Complete Streets policies in the upcoming TIP, in a summary table.

There is no new household travel survey. We finally have a five-year average on the American Community Survey, and on-line tools that allow users to look at walking and bicycling at the census tract level.

The greater Washington Metropolitan Statistical Area has seen a modest increase in bicycling. MSA's include the exurban counties, beyond even the TPB membership areas.

At the jurisdictional level, bicycling increased in the core, but fell or remained stable in the exurban areas. In some of the exurban counties, bicycling can go down when they start to grow, because there is more traffic on rural roads, plus there may be more long-distance commutes.

The Census measures your primary mode; you can only pick one, the longest portion of the trip.

Next steps include finishing the database. Mr. Farrell will distribute a table of staffing levels and bike plans which the Subcommittee members can confirm or note changes. We need to have an advisory group look at the chapters on best practices and goals and indicators to make sure those are still kosher.

Draft chapters will be posted on the Subcommittee web site as they are cleared for posting.

We will need to have the plan reviewed in time to be presented to the TPB Technical Committee on June 27<sup>th</sup>, then to the bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee in July, and to the TPB as an information item in July or September. That will keep us consistent with our timing from 2010, and keep us on the four year approval schedule.

Chris Wells, Cindy Engelhart, Jim Sebastian, and David Goodman volunteered to serve on the

bike ped plan advisory Group.

For follow-on actions, Mr. Farrell proposed a database update and progress report to the TPB every two years, and a full update to the plan every four years. Mr. Sebastian agreed.

The powerpoint will be posted to the web site.

## **5. Bicycle Beltline Work Group**

The group discussed what it should be called. Mr. Farrell said that calling it the beltway would imply that it would parallel the motor vehicle beltway, which is not necessarily what we want. Ms. Spiliotopoulos suggested a route farther out. Mr. Farrell suggested that we could have more than one loop route, perhaps two.

Mr. Farrell suggested that this group should accomplish the following tasks:

- Create a vision, as Jay Fisesette suggested, for what this loop route should be, what it should connect, what kind of facility it should be, and what it should accomplish. Mr. Farrell volunteered to write a discussion draft.
- Select one or more potential loop routes that would serve the goals outlined in the vision, and mark them on a map.
- Identify major gaps and projects already planned for those routes.
- Identify next steps and resources for next steps
  - Consultant support to come up with a list of projects needed to complete the loop routes, including both planned projects and new projects that would be needed.
  - Similar to the High Impace Complete Streets Access Improvements Study

Mr. Alvino distributed a copy of the old National Park Service plan. Ms. Engelhart said that the Mount Vernon Trail already has at least five routes on it already. Ms. Engelhart suggested looping farther west into Alexandria and Arlington County, sort of a cluster of loops.

Mr. Sebastian asked why we are doing this, because we may want to be cautious about deviating too far from what Mr. Fisetete has asked for, unless we're sure that we want something different. Mr. Eatough said that Mr. Fisetete wanted to focus on the remaining gaps to a loop.

Mr. Farrell said that one of the criteria that he will write into a discussion draft is achievability, "within reach" which is one of the themes of the RTPP. It should not take colossal amounts of money to make the loop route happen, and it should leverage facilities that already exist, and right of ways that already exist.

Ms. Engelhart said that we should have a longer-range vision. Mr. Farrell said that an inner loop

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee**  
**Notes from the May 20th, 2014 Meeting**  
Page 7

could give a push to filling the few remaining gaps in the inner loop, in making sure that the purple line includes a trail, and that the Anacostia River Trail and connections are finished, and the South Capitol Trail if we decide we want to go that way. Another exciting potential project would be a bridge from the Georgetown Waterfront to Theodore Roosevelt Island and the Mount Vernon Trail. Together with a K Street Cycle Track, riders go from either the Capitol Crescent Trail or the Rock Creek Trail to the Mount Vernon Trail without going on street. The current on street connection from the Mount Vernon Trail requires climbing up to the Key Bridge, and mixing with heavy traffic on M Street, not a good quality connection at all, or suitable for children.

Mr. Farrell said that what he liked about the inner loop is that it could provide a reason fill a couple of major gaps in the regional trail system. This is a vision that could be accomplished in much less than 40 years. The Georgetown BID has some money. National Park Service participation would be important.

Mr. Sebastian asked Mr. Farrell to review the next steps. Mr. Sebastian suggested that we schedule another meeting, use a flip chart to generate a vision, goals, and objectives, then highlight a route on the map, and report back to this committee. We should remember that we have a regional trails plan process which National Park Service will start in the Fall. Mr. Alvino expressed willingness to participate in this group.

Mr. Wetmore suggested Rockville to Tysons and the W&OD over the American Legion Bridge.

Mr. Jackson suggested that there be some sort of logo, and suggested that this could be used to improve some of the hours of access issues in the parks properties that control some of these trails would be helpful.

Mr. Jackson, Mr. Sebastian, Mr. Alvino, Mr. Eatough, Mr. Malouff, Ms. Engelhart, volunteered to serve on the work group.

We should hold the bike ped plan work group and the bike belt line group back to back since the membership overlaps.

## **6. Jurisdictional Update**

Skipped in the interest of time.

## **7. Other TPB Program Updates**

- **Workshops**

A green streets implementation workshop will happen July 28<sup>th</sup> or 29<sup>th</sup>. The NACTO urban

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee**  
**Notes from the May 20th, 2014 Meeting**  
Page 8

design guide quote came back high at \$10,000 for a one-day workshop. If it can't be made cheaper, we could put together our own version with local expertise. Mr. Sebastian promised to talk to David Vega. If worst comes to worst Mr. Sebastian can do it. We want this to be a meeting of fellow bureaucrats, not just a consultant talk.

- **Bike to Work Day**

Bike to Work Day got record registrations, 16,700 plus registered. About 25% actually rode due to the rain.

- **Complete Street in the TIP**

Complete Streets policies will be documented in the TIP, as discussed earlier. Mr. Sebastian asked how it was different from asking people whether they had bicycle and pedestrian accommodation in a project. Mr. Sebastian said that the people filling out the TIP may not know if their jurisdiction has a Complete Streets policy. Someone suggested that the question could be automated, so that jurisdictions that we know have a complete streets policy automatically get checked "yes".

Mr. Farrell said that we will still ask if a project has bicycle and pedestrian facilities, even if a jurisdiction does not have a Complete Streets policy. Mr. Sebastian asked what additional information we would get. Mr. Farrell replied that the next question is whether a project advances the agency's Complete Streets policy. If not, the next question is what exemption the agency is claiming, using a pull-down tab. The end product will be a table that shows how many projects advance its Complete Streets policy, and for those that do not what exceptions are being claimed.

Ms. Engelhart suggested automating the process further by making it automatic that any project including bicycle and pedestrian accommodation, is advancing the Complete Streets policy, if the agency has one. Mr. Sebastian said that no one is going to say that a project does not advance their Complete Streets policy. Mr. Sebastian suggested that Mr. Farrell circle back around with Andrew Austin to make sure the mechanics work, and avoid repetitiveness in the questions.

- **MAP-21 Safety Performance Measures**

Under MAP-21 there has been guidance coming out on safety performance measures, including fatality and serious injury rates over a five-year average on all public roads. There is no apparent requirement for MPO's to set goals under this rule.

One criticism of these requirements on the States, is that if a State, such as DC, has had a rapidly declining trendline, it may not be feasible to maintain that rate of improvement. Another

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee**  
**Notes from the May 20th, 2014 Meeting**  
Page 9

question is whether there should be separate nonmotorized targets. This is being dealt with elsewhere, at the TPB Technical Committee, but this Subcommittee may want to be aware of it. Comments are due by June 9<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Sebastian said that the State Highway Safety plans already have goals. Mr. Farrell replied that the difference was that failure to meet the goals, within certain trend-lines, can trigger penalties. Not all the rules have been released yet.

AMPO and MDOT have made comments already.

Mr. Wetmore suggested that pedestrian deaths can be masked by declines in motorized deaths. Progress is measured by deaths per VMT, as well as absolute deaths and serious injuries. Ms. Engelhart said that counts are more important than ever, and they need to be 24 hour counts, to measure exposure.

None of this prevents either States or MPO's from having their own emphasis areas and their own goals. From the point of viewing of not exposing yourself to penalties, we should avoid adding to these federal goals. Mr. Sebastian asked what those penalties were? Does lack of flexibility mean that HSIP funds will have to be devoted to pedestrian safety? Ms. Engelhart said that it might mean that safety money has to be spent in proportion to fatalities. Mr. Farrell said that he could not answer that question.

## **8. Other Business/Announcements**

Mr. Jackson complimented the last ad for Street Smart. Mr. Wetmore is working on trails along power lines. Ms. Engelhart is working with NHTSA and the State of Virginia on bicycle and pedestrian content of the driver's manual. NHTSA may use the results to create a national template. Mr. Sebastian said that 2/3 of the District's drivers are from out of state.

For the next meeting agenda we should look at sample tests and manuals from DC, Maryland, and Virginia, and discuss the contents. Ms. Engelhart suggest that we come up with recommendations for what should be in a manual. Mr. Sebastian asked if Mr. Farrell could do the inventory first. The manuals and tests are on line. The head of the DC DMV might be able to present. Oregon and Pennsylvania have a bicycle driver's manual. Mr. Sebastian said that the Maryland manual was pretty good. George Branyan wrote it.

## **9. Adjourned**