

MEETING SUMMARY

Active Transportation STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE – Mtg. 2 Wednesday, December 7, 2017

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

Attendee	Organization
Ray Winn	Arapahoe County
Huiliang Liu	Aurora
Ted Heyd	Bicycle Colorado
Sarah Grant	City and County of Broomfield
Tom Reiff	Castle Rock
Ken Brubaker	Colorado Dept. of Transportation
Dan Raine	Denver Public Works
Kayla Gilbert	Denver Public Health and Environment
Beth Doliboa	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
Beth Doliboa	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Steve Erickson	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Celeste Stragand	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Amy Branstetter	Douglas County
Jenny Young	Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
Rick Muriby	Golden
Yelena Onnen	Jefferson County
Julie George	LiveWell Colorado
Carolyn Parkinson	Parker
Paul DesRocher	Regional Transportation District
Karen Stuart	Smart Commute Metro North
Jessica Fields	Toole Design Group
Joe Fish	Toole Design Group
Kent Moorman	Thornton
Gabriella Arismendi	Westminster

The meeting started at 2:00 p.m.

Project Update: Current Tasks

Joe Fish and Jessica Fields, Toole Design Group, provided a brief update of current tasks.

- TDG is working with *Facility Inventory* data and will update the group as the task progresses.
- TDG is developing a *State of the Practice Review* summarizing best practices by MPOs and others on topics such as benefits of active transportation; bike/ped safety; performance measures; data/modeling; pedestrian planning at regional scale; short-term implementation methods; emerging trends; data management and integration; and funding sources.
- TDG is developing *Mode Share and Trip Patterns*, and compiling County Profiles for a snapshot of the bike/ped-related conditions in DRCOG counties. Profiles include demographic trends, travel trends, AT network, facilities and supporting systems, and an overview of the county's policies.

Jessica reviewed several 2015 travel patterns observed; i.e., means of transportation to work; county commute flows; vehicles available by household; H&T indices; and short trip analysis.

Public Engagement Activities

Jessica Fields provided additional detail on the development of the *Public Engagement Plan*.

Tools and techniques include:

- Active Transportation Stakeholder Committee (holding monthly meetings)
- Member government outreach (hold up to 10 meetings in subregional forums/groups in Spring/Summer 2018)
- Project webpage on the DRCOG website and social media presence
- Regional survey (anticipated start in early 2018)
- Online interactive map (by late Spring 2018)
- Public events (participate in community events in Spring/Summer 2018)
- Active transportation workshops (hold 3 workshops for key community stakeholders)
- Final roadshow (develop a video summary of ATP project recommendations in Fall 2018)

Comment:

- Dan Raine suggested including some public engagement strategies/techniques for handling critical conversations; i.e., on tradeoffs to bikeways, like loss of parking for dedicated bicycle/pedestrian travelways; or for dealing with adjacent property owners who feel in possession of right-of-way.

TIP Regional Share Eligible Bicycle Corridors Update

At the previous meeting (November 8), the committee was asked to review the bicycle corridor map and provide comment to update bicycle corridors that would be eligible for Regional Share funding in the next TIP Call for Projects. Jacob Riger said staff received a lot of good feedback from ATSC members.

Based on recent recommendations by the TIP Policy Work Group (December 6), Jacob proposed that instead of updating the corridor map now, bicycle projects submitted for regional share funding for the next TIP Call for Projects should be either: 1) in a local plan, or 2) be consistent with the (as is) bicycle corridor map. He explained this allows more flexibility for regional share eligibility for bicycle projects and allows the subregions to prioritize and identify their best, most competitive projects. He noted feedback received from committee members would be used in later stages of the Active Transportation Plan development process and thanked those who submitted thoughtful comments.

Comments:

- It was noted the draft bicycle corridor map is not used for TIP scoring purposes, only eligibility.
- It was noted that although up to 16 projects (2 projects per each of the 8 county-based subregions in the DRCOG area) can be submitted from the subregions to the Regional Call for Projects, it is likely only a couple/handful of projects will be selected for the Regional Share funding.
- It was noted communities in multiple counties, such as Aurora and Westminster, will be able to participate in each of its Subregional Forums.

The committee was in consensus with the TIP Policy Work Group's recommendation that bicycle projects submitted for regional share funding for the next TIP Call for Projects should be either: 1) in a local plan, or 2) be consistent with the (as is) bicycle corridor map.

Discussion and Breakout Groups

Breakout groups (about 45 minutes) were held to discuss:

- How does your county (and local community) active transportation plan(s) and/or policies relate to DRCOG and/or regional transportation?
- Which organizations in your county work on walking and biking issues?

- What would you like to find out through this regional survey (to 5000 people)? Please identify one connection to an adjacent community that would enhance active transportation.

Some general comments from the breakouts were noted:

Public Outreach – regional survey

- Understanding where people are traveling to and from (what are destinations and types of trips)
- Collecting demographic information
- Understanding current behavior - what are barriers, what kinds of trips are people making, how often, what length
- Understanding commuter and recreational, personal trips
- For biking, framing questions properly to reach the “interested, but concerned” population
- Would e-bikes make a difference, should they be allowed on trails and other facilities?
- Funding questions, what would people be willing to trade-off to add bike or pedestrian facility?

Identifying barriers across the region (map-based)

- Interstate network, high-speed arterials
- US-36 trail, it’s a great addition but can be difficult to get to from both sides – needs more work
- Poor connectivity in general; some areas may not be connected well to neighboring jurisdictions.
- ADA accessibility
- Natural barriers (i.e., streams, grade, etc.)
- Connectivity between trails (physical and perceived/wayfinding)
- Signal spacing along major arterials

How local active transportation plan(s) and/or policies relate to regional active transportation

- A lot of local transportation master plans have an Active Transportation component
- Some communities may not have a Complete Streets policy, but are integrating elements into roadway design as customary practice via adopted standards, etc.
- Talked about ways jurisdictions are funding and implementing bike/ped improvements (taking advantage of resurfacing projects and striping bike lanes, prioritizing sidewalk gap connections and access to trails)
- Talked about various bikeshare programs
- How jurisdictions have coordinated together
- First/Last Mile connections
- ADA transition plans

Which organizations in your county work on walking and biking issues?

- A long list of different advocacy, nonprofit, and/or health organizations, etc. outside local government

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.