

Summary of County Board and Commission/Committee Input on Draft Bike Framework

Long Range Planning Committee – November 1 meeting:

- Not clear yet what the big issues are. Best facilities possible or better geographic coverage?
- Revisions to Virginia State law needed for reflectors on bikes
- Want APS data on student bicycling
- Interest in more traffic calming to slow traffic speeds
- Lacks a principles policy guidance to go along with the Vision statement. Want principles that staff can reference and apply; example: It is the default presumption Type Ana B arterial streets will have bicycle lanes.
- Performance metrics: Look at what peer cities say about the percent of their total streets that should include bicycle lanes.
- Evaluate how trips shift mode over time; before and after installation of bike facilities
- Track time between complaints made and when repairs completed on bike lanes
- Are we reaching out to WABA and NPS? Regional coordination is critical.
- Dearth of north-south connectors. George Mason Drive should get PBLs.
- Make recommendations for facilities but allow for follow-up. Will not be able to work out all of the issues about facility types. How to designate what is desired?

Bicycle Advisory Committee – November 6 meeting:

- Disliked the statements about the perceived results of the survey questions to parents.
- Emphasize that bike facilities must be integral transportation infrastructure. Must feel safe and be convenient – bicyclist should not need to take a longer route.
- Bicycling is environmentally friendly and preferable to motor vehicles – impacts of trail improvements can be mitigated.
- Performance measures need to be weighted towards safety and comfort. Fewer injuries. See FHWA guidance on performance measures.
- Build flexibility into the plan for new developments and technology
- Add references about protecting bicyclists from air pollution due to adjacent traffic.
- Need communication strategies to address “cranky” issues
- Need to account for connectivity of Arlington to adjacent communities. Address Potomac River crossing improvements.
- Want Arlington to be an active participant in regional matters.
- Reinforce policies in POPS. Use same language where possible.

Transportation Commission – November 30 meeting:

- Preference for sharrow markings to be at right side of roadway rather than centered in the travel lane.

- Want to see ride-hailing vehicles, like Uber, addressed in plan. Currently regularly block bike lanes in Clarendon and R-B corridor.
- How can the bike parking requirement for by-right development be implemented? New development only?
- Concern about bicyclists that bypass school buses that are stopped for pick-ups and drop offs.
- Would like to have plan address situations where traffic volume on a trail exceeds that of crossing street. May want to have all-way STOP or switch the STOP signs to the road not trail.

County Board - December 5 work-session:

General:

- Define terms like “Low traffic stress” and “connectivity”
- Consider how the Bike Element corresponds with other elements like Curbspace Management
- Convenience is a big selling point. Need to imbed into policies and implementation actions
- Equity can be its own policy. Ensure that all Arlingtonians are able to use bicycle infrastructure
- Rework Safe Routes to Schools policy – too narrow.
- Address separation of modes (Bikes, pedestrians), especially in hot spots.
- When prioritizing projects need to distinguish between big projects and opportunities like street repaving.
- Connectivity is the key to the network working
- Might need a more robust approach to civility campaign.

Vision Zero:

- Interest in Vision Zero policy. Should be comprehensive, but can mention it in Bike Element.
- Come back to Board with options and recommendations for VZ.

Street Retrofits:

- Like listing range of considerations and factors, but don’t make it too explicit and numeric.
- Consider each facility proposal as a part in the overall transportation system. Establish the network to get away from ad hoc efforts.
- Provide criteria as a baseline but public engagement is needed.
- Want objective criteria that are guidelines. Don’t nail it down too hard – provide room to evolve.
- Provide objective data, and community context with public engagement.
- Be comprehensive; keep focus on network versus each facility
- Establish set of key routes that connect the priority destinations.
- Don’t want too much flexibility – can make it trade-offs too hard to make.

Trails:

- Need internal conversations to address issues.
- Want parks to be like parks but also recognize trails to be part of transportation system
- Maybe different approaches at different times of day
- Consider rules for electric bikes and dockless bikeshare

- Consider how trails are being addressed in POPS
- Not interested in environmental degradation; don't want to pave our way out of the problem.
- Identify what problems we are trying to solve and what are gains.
- Liked NOVA Parks presentation on mode separation but step into slowly. Be specific what problems are and where and address those particular problems.

Pedestrian Advisory Committee – December 13 meeting:

- Would like to have new/better means to report repair/maintenance requests
- Vision should include “fun”
- Need to better define “low traffic stress” and “comfortable”
- Trails and bike facilities should be part of overall roadway maintenance. Should be a policy that the County will be properly maintaining the facilities that it builds.
- Autonomous vehicles may (eventually) reduce the need for on-street parking as fewer persons own vehicles. Therefore, more road space may be available for bikes.
- Need to better explain what “comfort” means.
- Provide a glossary; include photos of sample facility types.
- Add citations for the benefits of bicycling
- Need to coordinate with work of the Capital Trails Network.

Also separate comments submitted by PAC Chair

Energy & Environmental Conservation Commission - December 18 meeting:

- Mention that protected bicycle lanes get bicyclists off of sidewalk – reduces conflicts with pedestrians
- Bicyclist behavior and bike lighting should be addressed. Seek bicyclists peer pressure for better/safer action.
- Shifting travel to bicycles will reduce the wear and tear on roadways from auto trips.
- Need to identify the bigger vision. How do all the small parts add up to the big picture.
- Speak to the bike and pedestrian conflicts on Key Bridge and Mt. Vernon Trail
- Need bike share opportunities at National Airport
- Stress the commercial gains from better bicycle facilities. CaBi stations can enhance local business opportunities.

Park & Recreation Commission – December 19 meeting:

- Requested more context about the benefits of bicycle facilities for other members of Arlington community. Mention that benefitting bicyclists can be good for all street and trail users. Speak about air quality improvements.
- Not all safety concerns and user conflicts can/should be addressed by technology and infrastructure efforts.

- Emphasize recreation more in the plan.
- There is interest in using permeable asphalt for trails.
- Equity issue of late night workers needing safe transport options when Metrorail is closed.
- Cross-reference the Public Open Spaces Plan. Trail types and uses.

Neighborhood Conservation Advisory Commission – January 11 (scheduled):

Neighborhood Complete Streets Commission – January 22 (scheduled):