



**BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE TRANSPORTATION SAFETY & ADVISORY COMMISSION
CITY OF HARRISONBURG, VIRGINIA**

TO: Bicycle & Pedestrian Subcommittee Members

FROM: Ian Pike, Transportation Systems Specialist

DATE: July 2016

RE: Bicycle & Pedestrian Subcommittee Meeting Summary for Monday July 25, 2016

The Bicycle & Pedestrian Subcommittee met on Monday May 23, 2016 at 6:00pm in City Council Chambers, 409 South Main St. Meetings are open to the public.

Welcome

Subcommittee members: Elise Barrella, Carl Droms, Alleyn Harned, Stefanie Warlick

Guests: Thanh Dang, Todd Gordon, Tom Hartman, Tom Jenkins, Ian Pike, Drew Williams

Business

1. Discuss Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan

a. Introduction of the Berkley Group

Mr. Gordon and Mr. Williams from the Berkley Group are present to help present their work on the Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan.

b. Update on Plan schedule

Mr. Williams shared that they are finishing up the ActiveTrans tool and on track with the following schedule:

- Update PC, TSAC, City Council – September/October
- Open House/Public Meeting – October/November
- Public Comment Period – November
- Planning Commission – February 2017
- City Council – March 2017

The Bicycle & Pedestrian Subcommittee and the Transportation Safety Advisory Commission will be involved throughout this process. The goal for the plan is to be no longer than 40 pages with easy-to-understand graphics.

c. ActiveTrans Priority Tool Methodology

A copy of the current methodology was sent to committee members prior to the meeting for review. Mr. Hartman explained how the methodology was developed using the ActiveTrans Priority Tool. Projects were identified from public meetings and grouped into four different categories: pedestrian intersections, pedestrian segments, bicycle segments, and shared-use paths. For each of these categories, the same five major factors are used to score the projects. Each major factor has its own weight in the score based on varying child factors. Not all child factors apply to each category of project. For example, some of the child factors have already been evaluated for bike segments as a part of the city-wide traffic stress model.

Mr. Gordon went on to describe the different scaling methods that are used when scoring a project. The methodology describes child factors as proportionate, inverse proportionate, quantile, or inverse quantile. The proportionate (or inverse proportionate) factors can be simple yes or no answers or small ranges of values. The quantile (or inverse quantile) factors tend to have larger ranges of values and thus need to be broken into either four or ten segments to provide an appropriate scale. A factor is described as inverse if a lower value provides a higher score, ultimately leading to a higher priority.

Mr. Gordon stepped through each child factor, explaining what it means and what assumptions were made to decide how each factor would be measured. After each factor was described, the committee opened up for discussion about the merits of the factor, whether the measurement should be changed, or whether the factor should remain as part of the methodology.

The following changes were made, as approved by the committee:

- Removed “Opportunity to phase” factor for all categories – Ms. Dang posed the idea that smaller projects that can’t be split into phases would rank worse than bigger projects that could be phased, even though the smaller projects could potentially be completed more quickly and with less need to acquire right-of-way or move utilities. Mr. Williams also noted that it would be difficult to decide beforehand what projects would need to be completed in phases. The committee agreed to remove this factor.
- Changed measurement of “Posted speed limit” and “Average daily traffic (ADT)” from inverse proportionate to proportionate for Ped Segment and Shared Use projects – Dr. Barrella mentioned that high-volume, high-speed corridors with no pedestrian facilities would rank lower when measured as inversely proportionate, even though there is a high number of pedestrians on those corridors already. Mr. Gordon suggested the committee decide if this tool should be used to prioritize safety or comfort. Prioritizing safety would add facilities on heavily-traveled vehicle corridors while prioritizing comfort would add facilities on quieter neighborhood corridors. The committee agreed that the tool should focus on safety over comfort.
- Added a note on roundabouts under “Type of traffic control” factor – this factor is related to the presence of a signal, though roundabouts are increasing as a traffic control device in place of roundabouts.

- Combined “Connects to existing sidewalk/path” and “Connects to proposed sidewalk/path” into one factor – Ms. Dang proposed combining these two factors to prioritize any project that makes a connection and furthers the goal of completing the city network. As separate factors, it would prioritize projects that connect to one existing and one proposed path over projects that would connect two existing paths. The committee agreed to combine as a single “yes” or “no” factor.
- Added “Safe routes to school” as a factor for pedestrian intersection projects – Ms. Warlick questioned why “Safe routes to school” was not a factor for pedestrian intersection projects. Mr. Hartman explained that they had originally been grouped with the pedestrian segment projects when evaluating whether a project should be marked as a “Safe Route to School”. The committee suggested it be added as a factor for pedestrian intersections to ensure we are properly prioritizing the “Safe Route to School” program.
- Added “Located on transit route” as a factor for bike segment projects – while describing this factor, Mr. Gordon asked the committee if it should be added for bike segment projects. Dr. Barrella suggested that since all the city buses have bike racks, it would be best to prioritize projects that connect transit riders with safe bike paths. The committee agreed to add this factor.
- Note to add maps used to determine equity score with the final plan document

2. Open Discussion

Mr. Hartman provided updates on the projects under design/construction that he would be presenting to the city council the following day. After discussing the plans for Exit 247, Dr. Barrella asked if there were plans to include pedestrian facilities on the bridge over I-81. Since this type of bridge-replacement project does not happen often, it is a rare opportunity to provide those facilities to pedestrians already using that corridor. Mr. Hartman noted this concern, and will raise it with VDOT during the next grant discussion.

Mr. Jenkins brought up a concern over encroaching vegetation on the bike path coming off of Neff Ave that leads into the JMU arboretum, but was unsure if it would be the city’s responsibility or JMU’s responsibility. Based on the location, it is within the city’s right-of-way so Mr. Hartman will bring it up with the appropriate people within the Public Works department.

Announcements

Adjourn

Next Meeting: Monday, September 26, 2016 at 6pm – Location: City Council Chambers, 409 South Main St