MEETING SUMMARY
Active Transportation
STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE – Mtg. 4
Wednesday, March 14, 2018
DRCOG, 1290 Broadway, Independence Pass Conference Rm., Denver, CO

Attendee	Organization
Ray Winn	Arapahoe County
Brenden Paradies	Aurora
Alex Hyde-Wright	Boulder County
Sarah Grant	City and County of Broomfield
Cate Townley (by phone)	Colorado Dept. Public Health & Environment
Flo Raitano	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Steve Erickson	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Emily Lindsey	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Daniel Hutton (by phone)	Denver South TMA
Amy Branstetter	Douglas County
Jenny Young	Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
Rick Muriby	Golden
Aaron Heumann	Littleton
Paul Aldretti	Mile High Connects
Ashley Kaade	Northglenn
Carolyn Parkinson	Parker
Cathy Bird (by phone)	Smart Commute Metro North
Jessica Fields	Toole Design Group
Joe Fish	Toole Design Group
Kent Moorman	Thornton
Jill Locantore	WalkDenver
Gabriella Arismendi	Westminster

Emily Lindsey, DRCOG, called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Project Updates
Joe Fish, Toole Design Group, provided a project update.
- The *State of the Practice Report* was emailed to the committee on March 12; results will inform ATS plan development.
- **Outcomes** – Currently in the process of developing more concrete goals/outcomes. Project team conducted Local Government Survey and results of the survey will inform the Active Transportation Plan (ATP) development.
- **Safety** – DRCOG is analyzing crash data and preliminary findings on safety trends will be presented at the May meeting.
- **Data Assessment** – Currently reviewing the DRCOG process for classifying bicycle facilities to ensure matching to industry standard definitions. (DRCOG collects local agency data and compiles to develop regional bicycle facility inventory dataset and webmap)
- **Regional Network** – Will focus on 'high-comfort' regional network; will take a first look at destinations at today's meeting used in demand analysis.

<u>Regional Network Initial Analysis</u>
Joe Fish reviewed several Origin/Destination categories, and asked the group to confirm that
the following categories make sense to use and to identify any missing features.

- Urban centers (DRCOG designation)
- Rail stations, park-n-rides, major bus stops
- Areas with high employment – regionwide and within counties
- Universities, colleges, high schools
- Regional parks
- Major trails

The committee was polled at the meeting on the following questions using Menti.com.
Polling results are as follow:

<u>How much of a priority are the following in creating a regional bike network?</u>
Top results:
1. Where people work
2. Major transit stops
3. Where people live
4. (Tie) Urban centers / Universities and high schools
5. Regional parks
6. (Tie) Low-vehicle households / Low-income households

<u>List other types of destinations that should be considered in the bike network development</u>.
Destinations suggested: event centers, regional trail hubs, small retail/commercial business
(restaurants, bars, cafes, grocery stores), entertainment venues, commercial corridors,
employment and population density, major healthcare centers, trail connectivity, and where
there is no transit connecting to event locations.

<u>What are the essential ingredients of a Regional High Comfort Network.</u>
Suggestions included:

- Connectivity of trail networks
- Physical separation between bikes/peds and vehicles, safe crossings
- Connecting live, work, play, destinations utilizing the lowest stress connections.
- Separate bike and ped areas
- Direct - Safe (actual and perceived). Well maintained (including plowing). Well signed. Clear connections to other bike facilities, destinations.
- Safe crossings!
- Dedicated walking or biking space, separation preferred (off street or buffers for bike)
- Accessibility- Safety (personal and traffic)
- Safety, ease of access, low to moderate grades, trail connections
- Easy connections and crossings
- Separations between bikes and peds – older adults walking request to be separated from high speed bicycles.
- High ease of use – protection/separation from traffic – connectivity
- On and off-street facilities – safe crossings – low and moderate grades – direct amenities
- Direct routing, connections to daily destinations (support useful trips, not just recreational), safe crossings
- Bike signals at high traffic intersections
- Go where I work
- Eliminating existing barriers (physical, perceived, etc.) and ensuring safe crossings
- Comfort = safety, so anything that can be done to make riders feel safer.
- Off-road bike paths with minimal at-grade road crossing, stoplights/signs – paths must be relatively direct and not wander all over.
- Effective wayfinding and signage.
- Cross-directional options that intersect the high comfort paths; example: US-36 Bikeway to Central Broomfield where residents live is very weak.
- Off-street or separated on-street facilities
- Connectivity and effective bicycle accommodations along the way, i.e., bike lanes, multiuse trails, racks, good clear informative signage.

<u>List some trails that you consider to be regionally significant</u>

- Cherry Creek Trail
- Clear Creek Trail
- High Line Canal Trail
- US 36 Bikeway
- C 470 Trail
- E 470 Trail
- Platte River Trail
- Big Dry Creek Trail
- Longmont-Boulder Trail
- East-West Trail
- Bear Creek Trail
- Mary Carter Greenway
- Little Dry Creek Trail
- Sand Creek Trail
- Rocky Mountain Greenway
- Signal Creek Trail
- Front Range Trail
- Boulder Creek Path
- Lakewood Gulch Trail
- Peaks to Plains Trail
- Piney Creek Trail
- 32nd Bike Route
- W Line Path
- Coal Creek Trail
- Westerly Creek Trail
- Tollgate
- Rock Creek Trail
- Genesee El Rancho Bikeway
- Plum Creek Trail
- St Vrain Greenway
- Alameda
- Central Jeffco Route
- 20th Ave
- 26th Ave
- Lefthand Greenway
- Ralston Creek Trail
- Broomfield Trail
- Centennial Trail
- Garrison Estes
- Kipling

<u>How much of a priority are the following in identifying regional pedestrian focus areas?</u>
Top results:

1. Major transit stops
2. Where people work
3. Where people live
4. (Tie) Urban centers / Universities and high schools
5. Older adult population
6. Low-vehicle households
7. Low-income households

<u>List other factors that should be considered to identify pedestrian focus areas.</u>
Suggestions included:

- Public art and plazas
- Event centers/venues
- Neighborhood centers
- Population and employment density. Crash data.
- Shopping/entertainment clusters
- Demographics access to healthcare/healthy food locations of social services
- Locations of pedestrian crashes – school zones
- Schools, local parks
- Parks and open spaces
- Event centers, where people shop, recreations areas
- Short building/entry setbacks, wider sidewalks or right-of-way
- Density, social service centers, crash data
- Connectivity between nearby towns – connectivity to nearby shopping centers which have been traditionally not accommodating to bikes.
- Existing travel sheds and the ability to integrate living streets into previous car-centric areas
- Crossings of railroad tracks and highways.

Interactive Mapping exercise
The committee participated in a 30-minute breakout session to identify locations they felt represent an important regional destination. The maps used in the exercise portrayed existing bicycle facilities, not proposed corridors. As part of the exercise, the committee identified some regionally significant trails not currently shown that the project team will incorporate into the analysis moving forward, and important regional destinations.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.