



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: September 29, 2016

RE: Bicycle & Pedestrian Subcommittee Meeting Summary for Monday, September 26, 2016

The Bicycle & Pedestrian Subcommittee met on Monday, September 26, 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, Eric Saner, Stefanie Warlick

Guests: Thanh Dang, Brendan Erb, Todd Gordon, Tom Hartman, Matt Hassman, Dastan Khaleel, Kyle Lawrence, Ian Pike, Erin Yancey

Business

- 1. Discuss Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan**
 - a. Review draft plan**

Formal comments are due by October 3.

Mrs. Yancey noted that other than grammar or typos, this discussion is geared towards content comments. Some comments that have already been received include that the maps are difficult to read due to scaling, other benefits and reasons for having the plan should be included (including references to the Economic Impact Analysis by the Central Shenandoah Planning District Commission), as well as the benefits of active transportation (including demographic statistics around millenials and baby boomers).

Mrs. Yancey also noted that on page 7 of the draft, the first bullet point under "Existing System Observations" stating "The system of bicycle lanes provides a framework for a fairly well integrated

system” is open to interpretation as far as the degree of integration. Ms. Dang agreed that the system is made up of more than just bike lanes and that there are some well-connected corridors, just not across the entire system.

Ms. Warlick asked if there needs to be much time and effort spent using statistics and data to argue for the existence of the plan and that it is unclear who is being argued against. Mrs. Yancey suggested that those data are for investors, decision makers, and non-cyclists. Dr. Barrella noted that the plan should try not to let cycling needs overshadow pedestrian needs because there needs to be a balance in infrastructure investment. Dr. Barrella also suggested that as the City’s Comprehensive Plan is updated, it should elevate the Bike & Pedestrian Plan. The Bike & Pedestrian Plan should give multiple reasons to its existence in order to appeal to different people.

Mrs. Yancey noted that there are several other City departments and organizations that should be recognized in the plan, including Parks & Recreation, Economic Development & Tourism, Public Transportation, and Valley Associates for Independent Living. Dr. Barrella asked if more information about the focus groups and the minutes from those meetings could be included in the plan for transparency and to show those citizens were heard. Mr. Gordon suggested formally adding them as an appendix.

Mrs. Yancey described how the top 10 projects for each facility type as prioritized by the ActiveTrans tool will be listed in the main text of the plan while the full list of projects, including project descriptions and score breakdown, will be included in the appendix. Ms. Dang suggested that since the project lists aren’t too long to fit on a single page that the full lists should be included in the main text, making it easier for readers to connect a project to its location on a map. The appendix would still show the full breakdown of the score.

Mr. Saner brought up the use of “Complete Streets” throughout the document without it being fully explained or officially adopted as a policy by the City. Ms. Dang recognized that the staff have an internal commitment to complete streets. Dr. Barrella suggested that a formal policy adoption by the City Council would reflect the commitment by city staff and would make it clear to private partners and investors as far as what the city expects. Dr. Barrella further explained that there is a range of ways to construct a “Complete Streets” policy that would also include revisiting design guidelines. Ms. Warlick suggested including “private streets” on page 26 in the first bullet point under “Engineering Steps”. On that same point, Ms. Dang suggested changing “commitment” to “vision”. Mrs. Yancey agreed to look up draft policies within city documents to include in the plan.

Mr. Hassman suggested that bringing up jaywalking in the enforcement section is anti-pedestrian and the plan should not promote enforcing laws against actions that are done to fill in the gaps in pedestrian infrastructure. Ms. Dang noted that she has passed on updated wording to Mrs. Yancey to include. Dr. Barrella suggested that there are already problems with mid-block crossings that could be addressed under a “Complete Streets” policy by changing thinking from where pedestrians should be to where pedestrians could be.

Ms. Warlick noted that the readability and flow of the document is well-done, though there is some disruption when the discussion moves from the ActiveTrans methodology to facility descriptions then back to projects and scoring. Ms. Warlick also noted that there is a lot of build-up to the final prioritization lists but no mention of how this list will be used other than to say this will not be the only metric used when analyzing projects. Ms. Dang suggested including how the list will inform future

planning and development. Mr. Hartman suggested adding the layering effect with other City plans (Transportation Master Plan, Comprehensive Plan, etc) and how citizens can get involved at each step of the development process.

Ms. Warlick asked how often the list will be updated and re-prioritized as citizens and developers suggest additional projects. Mr. Hartman responded that the plan will be updated every 5 years, while the project list might be re-evaluated every 2-3 years as projects are completed and other projects are suggested. Additional projects that are not currently listed will also be scored by the ActiveTrans tool to provide additional information when presenting to council, citizens, etc.

Mr. Lawrence asked if potential treatments for existing infrastructure or future projects could be added to the plan, including treatments that haven't yet been done in the city but are starting to show up around the region. Ms. Dang suggested include examples from the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guides on urban street design and urban bikeway design.

Mr. Saner mentioned noted that on page 15 of the draft, the second line in the first paragraph says that "streets are for cars" and also references "Complete Streets". By saying that "streets are for cars", it suggests that they are not also shared with bicyclists or pedestrians. Mrs. Yancey said that it will be reworded.

Mr. Saner asked that there be more information about current and ongoing projects, including those with future phases. Mr. Hartman suggested including the Year-In-Review list that will be provided at the Harrisonburg Bike/Walk Summit and referencing the city's Capital Improvement Plan.

Mr. Saner also asked if the city is developing its own Bike Parking Guidelines that could be included in the plan, instead of referencing others. Mrs. Yancey replied that the city is currently working on its own document. Dr. Barrella agreed that it would be good to highlight projects that aren't specific infrastructure projects, like bike parking, bike/pedestrian wayfinding guides, shade, and connection to stormwater and green infrastructure. Mr. Hartman said that bike parking is included in the plan while those other initiatives are better suited to be addressed outside of this plan, such as within the city's Design and Construction Standards Manual (DCSM).

Mr. Saner noted that the previous plan provided a breakdown of the cost per mile for a bike lane and for sidewalk and asked if that would be included in this plan. Mr. Gordon said it was a part of the plan in the beginning, but after diving into each project, there was too much variation for the information to be useful. Ms. Dang and Mr. Hartman agreed that having a range of cost would not accurately capture what is needed to complete each project and could prove detrimental to accomplishing projects should those costs need to change.

b. Update on Plan schedule

The next draft will be available around October 14. It will be sent to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Subcommittee and the Transportation Safety & Advisory Commission ahead of the joint meeting for review. The joint meeting will be on October 26. The public comment event will be on November 16 at Keister Elementary. It will be open house format with maps, documents, and comment cards. It will open the 30-day public comment period.

2. Committee member term expiration – new member app process

Dr. Barrella's and Mr. Saner's terms are up at the end of the year, however they are free to reapply. The application period will open on October 1, 2016 and close on October 31, 2016. More information, including the application, are posted on the Bicycle & Pedestrian Subcommittee website: <https://www.harrisonburgva.gov/bicycle-pedestrian-subcommittee>.

3. Open discussion

Dr. Barrella informed the committee that JMU is also undergoing updates to their transportation master plan and bike/pedestrian plan.

Adjourn

Next Meeting: Monday, November 28, 2016 at 6pm – Location: City Council Chambers, 409 South Main St