

## Summary of January 3, 2018 Bike Element Working Group Meeting

**Members Attending:** Chris Slatt, Gillian Burgess, James Schroll, Eric Goodman, Edgar Gil Rico, Yvonne Norton, Lindsay Marfurt, Mike Hanna, Chips Johnson

**Staff Attending:** David Patton, Alli Henry, Erin Potter, Ritch Viola

**Guests Attending:** Marcus Jolley

### Summary of Recent Public Outreach

Ritch handed out a summary of the comments received during presentations on the bicycle element method that have occurred since November. The comments were from individuals at the meetings and did not necessarily reflect the thoughts of the various commissions or committees involved. The comments cover a wide range of subjects although there are a few common areas including: desire to say more about the benefits of bicycling, should reference recreational bicycling more, certain terms should be defined in a glossary, trying permeable asphalt and conducting more safety education.

Attention was given to the County Board work session that took place on December 5. It is recommended that working group members view the recording of the work session on the County's website. The Board gave specific guidance in several areas including: Vision Zero, project prioritization and development of the bikeway network. There was some debate amongst the Board members as to how specific the facility recommendations should be with most advising to retain flexibility in the plan recommendations but to provide the criteria and principles need for determining what the facilities type should be.

There are still several presentations to be given to the NCAC and Neighborhood Complete Streets Commission. Other groups such as Arlington Community Transportation Committee, Disabilities advisory Commission and Commission on Aging are also being scheduled.

### Performance Measures

There was extensive discussion about how to shape the performance measures section. One idea is to determine how many additional bicycle trips will be needed to offset anticipated growth in travel demand due to local population changes. First calculate how many new trips are projected and have all of those trips be made by non SOV modes. Bicycling would be assigned a share of all the new trips. The performance measure is how many of the new trips are actually be made by bicycle.

A general thought is that it is important that performance measures be related to goal achievement. A challenge will be in finding regularly available data that can be tracked and used in the evaluation of goal achievement. One suggestion is to use data that is retrieved from our trail counters to track trends in bicycle use. Other data sources may be: US Census, the regional Household Travel Survey, Police crash reports and APS student travel surveys.

It was mentioned that the Public Open Spaces Plan has a measure along the lines of number (or percentage of) residents that have easy (1/4 mile) access to various park facilities. We could measure for bike facilities. It was also mentioned that we should be aware of/reference the goals in other plans such as the Community Energy Plan. Another suggestion is to use the measures that the League of American Bicyclists use in evaluating applications for Bicycle Friendly Cities awards.

Other items to track as performance measures include: education and outreach, student and adult bike safety training and police and staff training about bicycles. Other things that we would like to track include the number and locations of bicycle racks, and the numbers of parking facilities and showers inside buildings. Wayfinding signage system completion and percentage of traffic signals that are bicyclist- actuated are good example measures from the Minneapolis plan.

Tracking outcomes from educational efforts would be useful to know. May require specialized surveying. Another idea is to track how many unbanked persons are getting access to bikeshare through County partnerships. Need to reach a place where we agree on what a "low-traffic-stress bike route" is and what is considered to be accessible. It was suggested to look at our peer cities and NACTO for definitions that we can use. The terminology needs to be settled.

#### Upcoming activities

Need to wrap up the Framework development soon and get started on the Part 2 identification of the bikeway network components. County staff will work on a schedule for Phase 2. Much of the public outreach will be scheduled with upcoming events in the spring time. Can tie into Bike Month activities. Staff mentioned that the document is not likely to go into great detail with design and operations standards. Will reference other document such as NACTO guide and County staff produced standards and specifications.

The next meeting will be January 25 and will include more discussion of how the Phase 2 work will take place.