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Introduction

The purpose of the meeting, which was a continuation of the April 7 Complete Streets Implementation Team (CSIT) meeting, was to review semi-annual Complete Streets report, continue review of the comment log, and discuss the scheduling of upcoming supplemental meetings.

Jeff Riegner welcomed all attendees and reviewed the agenda. Leah Kacanda and Jeff led the group through the presentation attached to these minutes.

Semi-Annual Report

Leah provided an overview of the semi-annual Complete Streets report, which was provided to CSIT members in advance of the meeting. She walked through the document page by page and spent time reviewing the methodology used to develop the metrics for each of the 13 performance measures specified in the Complete Streets policy. Feedback on the draft document was requested by email by Friday, April 16.

The first two performance measures relate to safety as measured by the number and locations of fatalities and serious injuries in Howard County. The data was provided by Highway Safety. For those interested in more detailed information, that is available in the County’s Strategic Road Safety Plan.

Leah reviewed performance measures 3-5 which relate to the amount of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure installed or repaired. Currently, the numbers for FYI 2020 only include capital projects. Kris Jagarapu clarified there are multiple ways that physical improvements can occur, including via capital projects, road resurfacing, signal modifications, and maintenance. DPW is working to compile numbers for non-capital improvements for inclusion in the report.

Leah noted that data on performance measure 6, number of transit stops with sidewalk access, has not yet been provided. The metrics for measure 7-9 were provided by OOT. The percent of the BikeHoward and WalkHoward short term network are already tracked via HoCo Dash.

Leah shared that completing performance measure 10, percent of the population with direct access to a low-stress bike network, requires data from the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) who is currently wrapping up a statewide Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) model. Once the model is available, the data will need to be analyzed to generate the actual percentage of the population with access. MDOT will be making updates and refining the model over time, so percentages from year to year may vary based on model refinements in addition to changes in the network.

Jennifer White acknowledged that LTS is a quantitative assessment, but asked how the public can inform this measure. Leah replied that other communities review LTS data with people who ride and incorporate their feedback. Chris agreed and said MDOT is open to that approach. Jennifer asked how that process would work in Howard County. Chris replied that a discussion with the Bicycle Advisory Group (BAG) would be the first step. Leah noted that for this performance measure, the LTS data is being used to look at the entire bicycle network, but LTS data is also helpful for corridor projects. She stressed the importance of getting local input on the LTS model as individual projects are advanced.

Leah noted that performance measures 11 and 12, which concern connections to important destinations, rely on a routable sidewalk and pathway network in addition to the MDOT LTS data. OOT is working to determine how to best build out the sidewalk and pathway networks.

Larry Schoen asked why there was not safety data for 2020 available. Leah responded that there will always be a delay in compiling and validating crash data. Chris agreed, noting the County’s annual Strategic Road Safety Plan is released in the fall after data for the previous year is made available. Jeff noted that numbers of fatalities and serious injuries will always have a lot of variability from year to year when there is such a small sample size. This is one of
the reasons why safety data are looked at on a larger scale at the statewide level. When reported numbers are low, as is the case here, it often requires getting into individual traffic reports to understand what is going on.

Larry asked whether there is information available on the locations for performance measures 3-7. Chris replied that much of this information is available on HoCo Dash. Jeff noted that many of these measures are not tracked geographically, so adding them to a map would constitute significant additional effort beyond developing numbers for the report. Kris added that staff needs to work with limited resources to find a balance between doing the work and reporting on the work. Leah added that measures 10-13 are GIS-based and can be easily mapped.

Leah reviewed the next section of the document that describes public engagement undertaken during calendar year 2020. In addition to public meetings held, efforts being made to improve communication between the County and general public are listed. Chris noted that DPW may have hosted additional public engagement efforts that are not currently included. Kris replied he will provide information on DPW community engagement held during 2020.

The next section of the memo pertains to Complete Streets education or training. Although no trainings were held in 2020, a description of the three training modules that are under consideration to support changes to the Design Manual is included. Leah noted that the CSIT will be involved in the preparation of Complete Streets training materials.

Leah reviewed the additional measures section of the report which includes data from the Census, on transit ridership, and on the percentage of students within Howard County Public Schools walk zones. David Ramsay noted that school enrollment decreased from the 2019/2020 school year to the 2020/2021 school year but the district expects numbers to rebound in 2021/2022.

Jeff noted that the first time performance measures are documented it is just to establish a baseline. Over time, as elements of the Complete Streets policy are implemented, it will be interesting to see how policy changes result in changes to transportation projects and maintenance activities. In a few years these changes will be evidenced by changing performance measures.

Comment Log

Jeff led a review of the remaining comments ready for discussion. As with comments reviewed at the Wednesday CSIT meeting, most of these have been addressed by changes to the proposed street types.

Comments 51-53, 55

Larry provided comment 51, which noted that speeds lower than 35 mph will only be achieved along streets with curves. Since this time, sections have been revised to provide separated bike facilities on streets where higher speeds are anticipated. Larry noted that Neighborhood Yield Streets will have shared facilities and that some of them will likely have issues with speeding. Jeff replied that lower-density neighborhoods with less on-street parking will also feature a narrow 24-foot wide (curb to curb) street aimed at reducing speeding. The goal is to make sure that speeds are controlled on Neighborhood Yield Streets regardless of the level of on-street parking.

Comments 52, 53, and 55 shared similar concerns with on-street facilities. Physically separated bike facilities have been provided in each case.

Comment 56

In comment 56, Larry noted that conventional bike lanes could work for many streets as long as there is an alternate facility that provides LTS 1 accommodations. Jeff noted that this is a network planning consideration that may be better addressed in BikeHoward than in the Design Manual. Larry argued that LTS 1 should be the standard and that an exception should be required if providing anything other than LTS 1. Jeff referenced the Complete Streets policy and showed that one justification for seeking an exception is if “a project of equivalent scope and schedule exists or is already programmed for funding within the next five years to provide connectivity for all user groups.”
Carl noted that the consensus of the group has not been that LTS 1 should be the standard, noting, as an example, that that separated bike lanes on neighborhood streets are not appropriate. Chris said that the current proposed street types that the group has endorsed provide LTS 1 or 2. Leah said that neighborhood streets without a centerline are considered LTS 1 at 25 mph or less. Jeff said the Design Manual should specify where retrofits should aim for LTS 1 as opposed to 2. Chris and Jeff agreed that managing speeds on neighborhood streets is critical. Chris noted that decisions about what facility is appropriate would require referencing the proposed street types in the Design Manual.

Comment 57

Comment 57 from Larry regarded curbs being a safety issue when they are adjacent to the bike lanes. Jeff noted that curbs are needed for drainage, and bike lanes of sufficient width are commonly provided adjacent to curbs. The new proposed street types do not have this issue, but it can be referenced in the retrofits section of the Design Manual. Chad took exception to Larry’s comment, saying that no national guidance has a requirement to avoid vertical curbs. Kris noted that beveled curbs would still not avoid the pedal strike issue, and bicyclists need to take care to when passing other cyclists.

Larry asked if a sloped curb is viable since it would be more forgiving of human error and friendly to children biking. Jeff added that vertical curbs are necessary for drainage, for buses to board disabled passengers, and to provide some level of protection from cars running off the roadway. Chris and Jeff agreed that the presence of vertical curbs is not a significant issue as long as the bike lane has sufficient width. Larry suggested adding a note that the areas adjacent to shared use paths should be flush with the shared use path surface. Chad disagreed with providing a note, and John added that a note like this creates confusion for designers.

Jessica Bellah asked about intercepting runoff from cut slopes above shared use paths. Jeff replied that the current sections do not show slopes, but slopes will be included on the engineering drawings that will be part of the Chapter 3 and Volume IV work. John replied that runoff is usually collected at the bottom of the sidewalk and there is typically not a drainage way or swale. He clarified that this is usually a case-by-case decision and is beyond the scope of the Design Manual.

Comments 58-75

Jeff asked CSIT members to read over comments 58-75 and let the team know by email if there are any that have not been addressed. Larry asked about comment 69, regarding when a yellow line is warranted. Jeff replied that a double yellow line is generally provided where separate lanes are needed, not on most residential streets. Kris agreed, adding that generally, the double yellow line is provided on any roadway that is a collector or above. They are not placed on local residential roadways, although there are certain circumstances like intersection approaches where they are provided to define where cars should be located when they turn into a community.

Comment 76

Chad suggested that sidewalks only be provided on one side of cul-de-sacs with 10 homes or less. Chris expressed concern that in cases of a crash, someone “jaywalking” to reach the sidewalk might be found liable. David noted that he has received requests to run buses down cul-de-sacs without any sidewalks, and he is comfortable with the 10-house limit. Jessica asked how an accessible route is provided across the street to get on the sidewalk. Chris replied that driveways are generally used. John referenced the detail in Volume IV and noted that driveway aprons are available for access, but a ramp is also specified at the end of the sidewalk to provide access.

Chad noted that 6-house use-in-common driveways do not have sidewalks at all. Current subdivision regulations have sidewalks on one side in most single-family residential areas, with none on cul-de-sacs with 10 houses or less. David expressed support for sidewalks on both sides except for cul-de-sacs that serve 10 lots or fewer. The group reached consensus on this approach.
Comment 78-81

Jeff noted comments 78-81 were provided by Carl and asked if all comments were addressed to his satisfaction. Carl agreed that all points have been resolved.

Supplemental Meeting Schedule

Jeff asked the group if the Friday following each regularly scheduled monthly CSIT meeting at 1 pm works as a supplemental meeting time. There were no objections and Jeff noted he would send out calendar invitations for May 7, June 4, and July 9.

Next Steps

Jeff asked for comments on Chapter 4, the comment log, and the County Council memo by next Friday, April 16. He noted the CSIT does not need to approve the memo, but comments are welcome. Leah agreed that receiving comments on the memo by April 16 would allow sufficient time to incorporate them into the final draft.

John asked when the Design Manual is due. Jeff replied that the requirement is to go to County Council in October. The goal is to have sections ready for public input in July with the understanding that some edits will be required. He asked whether going to the Public Works Board in September would allow sufficient time for their review. John replied that it may be better to bring the draft document with comments in hand to the Public Works Board in August (and again in September, if needed after revisions have been made) to ensure adequate time for review.

Jennifer White asked for an update on the overall timeline. She commented that it seems like work is underway that would impact Chapter 3 and Chapter 2 and would like a good sense of the CSIT review process. Jeff noted the most recently shared schedule will be adjusted slightly, but generally comments will be due back the Friday following the CSIT meetings, or a 7- to 9-day turnaround for each item. Chapter 3, which is the street design chapter, will have a lot of changes and three meetings are set aside for discussions. Chapters 1, 2, and 5 will each be discussed at two separate meetings. There will be a review period following each set of meetings.

Action items from this meeting include:

- CSIT members are to review the comment log, County Council memo, and Chapter 4 and provide comments via email by April 16

The next regularly scheduled CSIT meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 5 at 3:00 pm, followed by Friday, May 7 at 1:00 pm.

Leah Kacanda, AICP