MEETING SUMMARY

Active Transportation
STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE – Mtg. 3
Wednesday, February 14, 2018
DRCOG, 1290 Broadway, Independence Pass Conference Rm., Denver, CO

Attendee	Organization
Ray Winn	Arapahoe County
Huiliang Liu	Aurora
Alex Hyde-Wright	Boulder County
Sarah Grant	City and County of Broomfield
Cate Townley	Colorado Dept. Public Health & Environment
Ken Brubaker	Colorado Dept. of Transportation
Dan Raine	Denver Public Works
Christine Connally	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Beth Doliboa	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Steve Erickson	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Emily Lindsey	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Jacob Riger	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Celeste Stragand	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Jerry Stigall	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Amy Branstetter	Douglas County
Jenny Young	Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
Rick Muriby	Golden
Yelena Onnen	Jefferson County
Paul Aldretti	Mile High Connects
Sonya Wytinck (by phone)	National Research Center, Inc.
Ashley Kaade	Northglenn
Paul DesRocher	Regional Transportation District
Cathy Bird	Smart Commute Metro North
Alex Ariniello	Superior
Jessica Fields	Toole Design Group
Joe Fish	Toole Design Group
Michele Scanze	Toole Design Group
Kent Moorman	Thornton
Julia Woodward	University of Colorado, Anschutz-Center on Aging
Jessica Vargas	WalkDenver
Gabriella Arismendi	Westminster

1. Introductions and Agenda Overview

Emily Lindsey called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. This meeting will include: an overview best practices in active transportation planning from other MPOs in the State of the Practice report, summary of local active transportation-related plans, Active Transportation Plan (ATP) relationship to *Metro Vision* and planning framework, and ATSC and stakeholder input.

2. Planning Framework

Emily Lindsey reviewed key themes and outcomes of the DRCOG *Metro Vision* plan that tie into the Active Transportation Plan. These elements will be incorporated into the ATP planning framework and relate back to *Metro Vision* performance measures and targets.

Metro Vision Themes*:*
1. An Efficient and Predictable Development Pattern
2. A Connected Multimodal Region
3. A Safe and Resilient Natural and Built Environment
4. Healthy, Inclusive and Livable Communities
5. A Vibrant Regional Economy

To provide additional context, Emily highlighted a few of the active transportation-related *Metro Vision* Outcomes:
- Outcome 4: The regional transportation system is **well-connected** and serves all modes of travel.
- Outcome 5: The transportation system is **safe**, **reliable**, and **well-maintained**.
- Outcome 10: The built and natural environment supports **healthy** and **active choices**.

She noted that active transportation elements appeared throughout the planning framework of the regional plan and thematic elements ranged from safety to connectivity and usability and public health, and these elements would be echoed throughout the ATP planning framework.

Comment:
- Dan Raine suggested adding reliability or consistency/availability of services, though this might already be captured in maintenance.

Connection to *Metro Vision*
Jerry Stigall, DRCOG Organizational Development Director, gave an overview of the strategic planning framework for *Metro Vision*. Emily noted the ATP planning framework would relate to the performance-based planning framework in both *Metro Vision* and the *Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan*. The project team wants to ensure strategies identified in the ATP link to *Metro Vision* themes, outcomes, performance measures and targets.

Local Plan Summary Review
The committee was previously asked to submit local plans in their area relevant to active transportation to the project team. A draft hyperlinked inventory has been compiled. Emily asked members to review the list and email her any missing plans, so all relevant local plans will be considered. The deadline for submitting plan summaries was extended to February 23. Emily will send out a digital copy of the list to the group for their review.

Jessica Fish, Toole Design, reviewed initial themes from the input solicited from the committee.

Prioritize Safety
- Apply a **low-stress** filter for biking and provide guidelines for all ages and abilities
- Consider **injury severity** and underreporting of incidents

Implementation
- Tie ATP into **local plans**
- Integrate with **transit** and **bike share**
- Policy and program recommendations

Forward-Thinking
- Understand and consider **emerging trends**: e-bikes, dockless bike share, autonomous vehicles

Focus on Equity
- 'Long lines' on a map are not realistic for vulnerable groups
- Use **equity** and **health** as guiding principles
- Non-traditional **outreach**

- Make sure we use simple materials and in multiple languages
- Include **smaller communities**
- **All ages and abilities**

Comments:
- Dan Raine suggested compiling a resource matrix of all the different local policies for communities in the region. This might include e-bike policies, dockless bike share information, vision zero, etc. Might be good to include contact information as well.

3. Local Government Survey

Jenny Young, FHU, presented a draft of the stakeholder/agency survey that will distributed to a broad range of local government staff across the region. She asked for committee feedback on the questions under consideration. Once the survey language has been finalized based on the input of the ATSC, DRCOG will email the survey to local jurisdiction contacts with a two-week turnaround for responses to be submitted.

The committee reviewed proposed questions and discussed themes that included:
- Look at equity beyond reaching those traditionally not reached by the planning process.
- Clarify language regarding pedestrian priority areas.
- For building a bicycle network, look at areas not served by transit.
- There is important value in data visualizations.
- What about e-bike policies? Consider adding question about this.
- Bike share question shouldn't be limited to dockless, inquire about station-based as well.
- Include question about Vision Zero.
- What about design guidance? Best practices?

The group discussed upcoming work on the bicycle and pedestrian safety report, an update to a 2012 report that considered trends, factors, and locations of bicycle and pedestrian related traffic fatalities, serious injuries, and property damage only crashes. Emily noted preliminary data related to bicycle and pedestrian safety will be coming to the Committee in the next couple of months.

4. Resident Survey

Joe Fish introduced Sonya Wytinck of the National Research Center (on conference call), who is the consultant on the Resident Survey. This survey is aimed at reaching a statistically valid sample of the population across the DRCOG region. Joe reviewed three survey themes to elicit understanding of: the types of barriers to bicycling and walking; the potential for increasing active transportation; and the different needs across the region. He noted 5,000 households would be surveyed, with an expected response rate of 350-900 completed responses. The mailed-out survey will have an online response option. Joe noted that once this survey is developed, the project team will create a unique URL and use the same questions for a broader distribution across stakeholder groups and to the general public.

5. State of the Practice Preview

Joe Fish presented an overview of preliminary findings of the report that will list various active transportation best practices of MPOs throughout the country. He gave a preview of several MPOs best practices on topics such as Safety, Incorporating Health into Transportation Planning, Bike/Ped Count Programs, Project Prioritization, Emerging Trends, Regional Bike Network Planning, and Regional Pedestrian Planning. The State of the Practice report will be sent out before the next meeting in March.

Jessica facilitated a discussion on how can a regional bicycle/pedestrian vision could be most useful to local communities. The discussion included thoughts on:
- Regional wayfinding needs consistency
- Network identification could guide transportation investments (across all modes)
- Specific alignment vs. conceptual corridors
- Tiering network routes
- Potential re-thinking of tiering schemes (i.e. advocate, encourage, horizon)
- Show on- and off-road corridors
- Conceptual corridors okay for shared use paths
- Pedestrian planning should focus on transit service (stops/stations)
- Best practices should be highlighted

6. <u>Facility Inventory</u>

Michele Scanze, Toole Design, presented data collected by DRCOG staff from local agencies on existing bicycle facilities and sidewalks. She noted DRCOG staff has applied consistent definitions across the local agency data to give the various datasets consistency across the region. She noted DRCOG continuously updates the information as received and provides a more high-level snapshot analysis of the existing types of facilities throughout the region. Michele provided an overview of some of the data that looked at existing bicycle facilities (one centerline only; non-directional), sidewalks, and shared use paths.

Michele highlighted work that looked at facility data by urban centers and county geographies, and the potential to aggregate information based on other factors like low- or no- vehicle households, environmental justice areas, etc. It was noted methodology *is different* for bicycle facilities and sidewalks; i.e., bike lane on both sides of the street counts as 1, but sidewalks on both sides counts as 2. The dataset for bicycle facilities does not include directionality.

There will be more robust existing conditions data analysis as the planning process continues and as county profiles, user profiles, and system-wide analysis is developed.

<u>Next Meeting and Other Announcements</u>

The meeting adjourned at 4:14 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for March 14, 2018, at 2:00 p.m.