

## MEETING SUMMARY

### Active Transportation STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE Wednesday, November 8, 2017

DRCOG, 1290 Broadway, Independence Pass Conference Rm., Denver, CO

| <b>Attendee</b>       | <b>Organization</b>                           |
|-----------------------|---|
| Ray Winn              | Arapahoe County                               |
| Huilian Liu           | Aurora  |
| Ted Heyd              | Bicycle Colorado                              |
| Alex Hyde-Wright      | Boulder County                                |
| Sarah Grant           | Broomfield                                    |
| Tom Reiff             | Castle Rock                                   |
| Ken Brubaker          | Colorado Dept. of Transportation              |
| Cate Townley          | Colorado Dept. of Public Health & Environment |
| Dan Raine             | Denver  |
| Janice Finch          | Denver  |
| Celeste Stragand      | Denver Regional Council of Governments        |
| Emily Lindsey         | Denver Regional Council of Governments        |
| Flo Raitano           | Denver Regional Council of Governments        |
| Jacob Riger           | Denver Regional Council of Governments        |
| Steve Cook            | Denver Regional Council of Governments        |
| Steve Erickson        | Denver Regional Council of Governments        |
| Todd Cottrell         | Denver Regional Council of Governments        |
| Jenny Young           | Felsburg Holt & Ullevig                       |
| Kevin Ash             | Frederick                                     |
| Rick Muriby           | Golden  |
| Yelena Onnen          | Jefferson County                              |
| Phil Greenwald        | Longmont                                      |
| Paul Aldretti         | Mile High Connects                            |
| Angie Rivera-Malpiede | Northeast Transportation Connections          |
| Ashley Kaade          | Northglenn                                    |
| Carolyn Parkinson     | Parker  |
| Paul DesRocher        | Regional Transportation District              |
| Karen Stewart         | Smart Commute                                 |
| Jessica Fields        | Toole Design Group                            |
| Joe Fish              | Toole Design Group                            |
| Michele Scanze        | Toole Design Group                            |
| Kent Moorman          | Thornton                                      |
| Daniel Jennings       | University of Colorado Denver                 |
| Gaby Arismendi        | Westminster                                   |

#### **Introductions**

Jessica Fields, project manager with Toole Design Group, along with Emily Lindsey, DRCOG project lead for the *Active Transportation (AT) Plan*, called to order the initial meeting of the regional Active Transportation Stakeholders Committee (ATSC) at 2:00 p.m. A round of introductions by the 34 attendees was made.

#### **Project Background**

Toole Design Group is the lead consultant on the AT plan development project and will develop the plan in conjunction with DRCOG. Other subconsultants on the AT plan project include:

- Felsburg, Holt & Ullevig (planning/analysis and public outreach support)
- National Research Center (survey work)
- Bicycle Colorado (policy and planning support)
- Two Hundred (video and web support)

Emily Lindsey described DRCOG's role in regional transportation planning, and noted many important active transportation concepts/themes are included in DRCOG's overarching *Metro Vision* plan and the *Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan*. The AT plan is the first plan of its kind for DRCOG, though previous efforts (i.e., the Pedestrian and Bicycle Element, etc.) have taken place. The final AT plan will be developed as a stand-alone plan and will eventually be incorporated into the *Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan*.

The purpose of the DRCOG *Active Transportation Plan* is to develop a regional active transportation vision, an implementable plan, and products that support the development of a robust active transportation network in the DRCOG region.

The AT plan study area covers an area of ten counties within the DRCOG region, beyond the MPO area. The DRCOG region has a population of over 3 million people today, with over 4 million forecasted in 2040.

### **Project Scope/Timeline and Role of ATSC**

Joe Fish, Toole Design Group, presented an overview of the anticipated one-year development process. The development process includes:

- Defining and developing a **regional bicycle network vision**
- Evaluating **existing conditions**
- Extensive **stakeholder involvement**
- Producing a plan that documents **regional opportunities** for active transportation planning

He highlighted that the process will not duplicate local planning efforts or include local project development.

Over the next year, the project will include:

- **Public Engagement** (Stakeholder and public engagement, member agency outreach, online interactive engagement, public events)
- **Discovery and Policy Context** (State of the practice, review of existing policies and programs; Survey to establish Active Transportation User Profiles)
- **Existing Conditions Analysis** (Facilities inventory mapping, mode share and trip patterns, safety analysis, county profiles)
- **Goals, Recommendations and Plan Development** (Objectives, performance measures, program and process strategies, Regional Bicycle Network Vision, and an implementation plan)

A draft project timeline was provided; the anticipated end of project is late summer/early fall, 2018.

|   | 2017 |   |   | 2018 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|------|---|---|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|   | O    | N | D | J    | F | M | A | M | J | J | A | S |
| <b>1 Public Engagement</b>                          |      |   |   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1.1 Public Engagement Plan                          |      | D |   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1.2 AT Stakeholder Committee                        |      | • | • | •    | • | • | • | • | • | • | • | • |
| 1.3 Website Content                                 |      |   |   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1.4 Online Interactive Map                          |      |   |   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1.5 Public Input                                    |      |   |   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | D |
| 1.6 Final Product Roadshow                          |      |   |   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | D |
| <b>2 Information Discovery and Policy Context</b>   |      |   |   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2.1 Literature Review and State of the Practice     |      |   | • | D    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2.2 Review DRCOG Policies, Process, and Programs    |      |   |   | D    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2.3 Related Plans, Policies, and Organizations      |      |   |   | D    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <b>3 Existing Conditions Analysis and Synthesis</b> |      |   |   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3.1 Facilities Inventory and Mapping                |      |   |   |      |   |   | D |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3.2 Mode Share and Trip Patterns                    |      |   |   |      |   |   | D |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3.3 Safety  |      |   |   |      |   |   | D |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3.4 County Profiles                                 |      |   |   |      |   |   | D |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3.5 User Profiles (Survey)                          |      |   |   |      |   |   | D |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3.6 Data Assessment                                 |      |   |   |      |   |   | D |   |   |   |   |   |
| <b>4 Goals, Recommendations, Plan Development</b>   |      |   |   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4.1 Strategic Framework                             |      |   |   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   | D |   |
| 4.2 Program and Process Strategies                  |      |   |   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   | D |   |
| 4.3 TIP Prioritization                              |      |   |   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   | D |   |
| 4.4 Bicycle Network Vision                          |      |   |   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   | D |   |
| 4.5 Implementation Plan                             |      |   |   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | D |
| 4.6 Plan Development                                |      |   |   |      |   |   |   |   |   |   | D | D |

D Milestone/Deliverable due  
• Meeting (date TBD)

The committee was asked to:

- Participate in monthly meetings
- Provide data and information
- Review and provide feedback on plan materials
- Help guide the team’s public outreach
- Represent their counties
  - Distribute information
  - Pass on feedback
- Embrace a locally-sensitive regional view
- Be ambassadors for the Regional Active Transportation Plan

**What We Know: Overview of Active Transportation in the Region**

Jessica Fields discussed national and local trends, and noted trends such as having a focus on the low-stress network approach, planning for the “interested but concerned’ bicycle rider; trip-making, first/last mile connections; safety issues, etc.

She reviewed some of the existing conditions regarding active transportation in the Denver region, which included: commute mode-share, high-use facilities, trip distances, first/last mile connections, safety statistics, and the variety of land use types across the region.

**Developing a Regional Bicycle Network Vision**

Emily Lindsey asked the committee to consider what a *future* vision of a regional network for active transportation in the Denver region could be. The Vision will connect to *Metro Vision* outcomes and

support action toward performance targets (e.g., SOV mode share, VMT reduction, etc.). She emphasized the importance of developing a long-range vision that looks at active transportation safety, ease of use, connectivity, and other important criteria.

Jacob Riger discussed a separate, but related DRCOG process currently underway by the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Policy Work Group to develop the TIP Policy for the FY 2020-2023 TIP. He noted that historically, DRCOG conducted a single TIP call for projects every four years, but with the development of the next TIP, there will be a two-tiered process: 1) regional share projects/programs, and 2) subregional share projects/programs. The dual model TIP will be county (geography) based for the subregional share.

Jacob requested the ATSC review the draft bicycle corridor eligibility map (“Draft TIP Regional Share Eligible Bicycle Corridors”) and submit comments that will help define bicycle corridors that would be eligible for regional share funding in the regional call for projects. Jacob clarified this map is not the same as the *Regional Bicycle Network Vision*, which Emily previously described, that will be developed throughout the AT plan process.

The committee was asked to provide comments to Jacob or Emily by December 1. The TIP Policy Work Group needs a draft map by February 2018 (prior to the Regional TIP call for projects). Jacob said that once completed, this map would only be used for the regional call for projects, **not** the subregional call for projects.

#### *Group Discussion/Comments*

- Consider adding the Highline Canal to the map.
- Staff should look at Strava data to compare with corridors on the map.
- Commented that Active Transportation and bicycling seem to be used synonymously; bicycling doesn’t encompass all Active Transportation; should be representative of all modes.

Jessica Fields noted the new *Regional Bicycle Network Vision* will be a collaborative technical effort of this committee and include a much more robust process over the next year.

#### **Group Discussion**

*Comments on “What would be a successful outcome of this ATP for your organization?”*

- Have a tie-in to local plans (regional trails into local trails; if regional trail, have a specific wayfinding sign/symbol)
- Look at trail barriers; look at grade separations vs. at-grade to continue trail
- Integrate all active modes of transportation; be system-wide
- Important to have connectivity with transit to connect with vulnerable populations who might more consider bicycling on shorter trips.
- Have continuity in wayfinding signs; use same signs/symbols
- Important to call out equity impacts to increase accessibility
- Agreed with having emphasis on low stress network; also has a cost benefit
- Identify gaps (sidewalk, trail) including having information about trail composition.

- Questioned that community outreach is scheduled for early 2018, but noted that many diverse population events are held in the summer.
- Consider injury levels, not just fatalities, in the crash data
- Suggested using more dynamic ways of capturing information and outreach (a hotline, web access, using Google Docs, work with local news stations)
- Consider that active transportation is not just alternative transportation; for some, it's primary transportation
- Storytelling of the "why" of active transportation is important; having a videographer is a good idea
- Utilize the TMAs for outreach
- Involve and engage the smaller communities
- Look at the lessons learned from the Glenwood Canyon bridge project (interesting survey work)
- Develop "all ages and abilities" guidelines
- Utilize social media and sponsored posts (Facebook, Twitter, etc.)
- Outreach using multiple languages; keep surveys simple; no meetings on Monday's or Wednesday's at 3:00
- If corridors are to be designated as Active Transportation corridor, will need to define what stress level it is, or it defaults to CDOT's decision
- Consider trend to autonomous vehicle
- Consider regional bicycle superhighway
- Consider e-bike usage
- Are we evaluating existing programs?
- Consider Safety issues
- Actually implement the projects, not just plan projects
- Create a mode share goal. Staff noted Metro Vision goal is 35% of non-SOV for work commute by 2040; is currently at 25%.
- Could break mode share goal down to bike/pedestrian goal?

The meeting ended at 3:40 p.m. A doodle poll will be emailed to members to determine the next meeting date. (December 7, 2017 at 2:00 p.m.)