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Introduction, roll call, agenda review

Bryan Townsend started the Complete Streets Implementation Team (CSIT) meeting at 12:30 PM, making note the earlier start time is to allow sufficient time to discuss the Public Workshops and public survey tool. He noted the remainder of the meeting will be used to review one revision to Chapter 1, and updates to Chapter 5 that were made to bring it into alignment with Chapter 2.

Leah Kacanda showed the draft of the survey tool on the SurveyMonkey platform. Chris Eatough added that SurveyMonkey is being used because it will organize the feedback on the Design Manual and allow the County to collect background information on survey participants. The survey is broken down by chapter and asks participants to reference page numbers. Chris noted that an additional question should be added for the Volume IV details. Chris also noted that comments e-mailed to the Office of Transportation (for instance, a markup of the Design Manual) will be accepted for review.

Jennifer White asked whether any guidance would be provided for workshop attendees or survey participants who may not fully understand some of the more technical language and content of the Design Manual. Leah replied that workshop presentation will be designed to help users understand the material. The presentation will cross-reference the Design Manual and provide an overview of more technical content. Chris added that the goal for the workshops is to walk the public through the basics on all the material covered in the Design Manual revisions. The first workshop is scheduled for the evening of Thursday, October 14, 2021 and will focus on Chapter 1. The second workshop is intended for a more technical audience and is scheduled for the afternoon of Thursday, October 21, 2021, and will cover Chapters 2, 3, and 5.

Christiana Rigby asked if the survey is intended for people who attended the workshops or for a broader audience. Leah clarified that people did not need to attend the workshops to take the survey. Leah suggested adding a link at the beginning of the survey to the draft Design Manual and to the workshop registration(s)/workshop recording(s). Christiana asked how the group could support people in understanding this material better and suggested providing visuals that compare the current Design Manual to the proposed Design Manual. Leah shared that the presentation will contain a lot of visuals and will feature Howard County examples that illustrate changes in the Design Manual. WRA intends to provide the CSIT a copy of the draft presentation by Tuesday, October 12, 2021. Christiana added that it would be beneficial to make a note at the beginning of the survey that states users will benefit from reading the draft version of the Design Manual before taking the survey.

Larry Schoen asked that the retrofit process be explained in a way that is easy for the public to understand. Bryan agreed and noted the team will use photographs to help illustrate the retrofit process. Leah asked the group to send any before and after photos of retrofit projects to the team for use in the presentation.

Bryan explained that the second workshop will provide technical professionals with an overview of the new material in the Design Manual and how it will impact the design of their projects. The second workshop will include information on the new street types, retrofits, studies, tools to for speed management, information on design and control vehicles, and bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. Cory Summerson emphasized that the public should be informed that the material included in the Design Manual builds upon best practices employed in Complete Streets work that has been done in other communities. Providing examples of best practices will help the public feel more comfortable with the revisions. Larry also asked if there are any questions on the survey that characterize the user (i.e. are you a biker, walker, developer, resident, etc.) Chris replied that information on other municipalities will be worked into the presentations and noted that questions characterizing survey participants are included as part of the survey.

Leah presented the slides for the Thursday, October 14, 2021 workshop for the group, agreeing with earlier comments that providing context for the public is very important. She thanked CSIT members for their feedback.
Meeting minutes from 9/24

There were no comments on the meeting minutes from Friday, September 24, 2021. Chris made a motion to approve the minutes and Jessica Bellah seconded the motion. Larry and Christiana abstained from voting because they were not in attendance at the meeting, and the remainder of CSIT members approved the minutes unanimously.

Review of final Chapter 1 (Introduction) revisions

Bryan shared the final Chapter 1 revisions. As discussed at the last CSIT meeting, a number of street design elements are associated with functional classification, even if they are new streets. In order to address this issue, a new table will be provided as an appendix to Chapter 1 that correlates new Street Types with a functional classification. A cross-reference to the new appendix was added to the street types section. Carl Gutschick asked if the appendix includes anticipated Average Daily Traffic (ADT) for each new street type. Bryan replied that anticipated ADT is provided in the charts within the body of the street type section of the chapter.

Review of final Chapter 5 (Multimodal Traffic Studies) revisions

Bryan provided an overview of changes to Chapter 5 that were made to bring it in alignment with the proposed draft of Chapter 2. No substantive changes were made to Chapter 5 content. In his comments, Larry highlighted some sections of Chapter 5 that provided design guidance, which is both confusing and redundant to Chapter 2. Bryan noted new language has been added to the first paragraph of Chapter 5 that better introduces the purpose of the chapter. Throughout Chapter 5, some language has been removed or relocated to Chapter 2. In other instances, cross references to Chapter 2 have been provided instead of repeating text.

Larry expressed concern with the blanket exemptions that are used at the start of the studies chapter that notes not all projects may require all six study types. Of the six study types, the final say on what studies are required for a particular project is made by the Department of Public Works (DPW) in consultation with the Office of Transportation (OoT). Bryan replied that the speculative examples of why certain types of projects may be exempt from certain studies can be removed. Larry agreed with removing the text, since DPW will be making the final determination regardless. There were no objections from the group.

Review of final Chapter 2 (Street Design) revisions

Bryan provided an overview of final draft of Chapter 2 (Street Design). He noted that a markup of the Chapter was distributed in advance of the meeting. Specific revisions are noted in the attached meeting materials. Questions and comments from members of the CSIT on those revisions are included in these minutes.

Design Speed

Bryan noted that no revisions were made to Table 2-1, Street Type Target Speeds and Design Speeds. The draft Design Manual is promoting lower travel speeds on all Howard County Streets. The proposed design speeds for new street types are lower than design speeds used in the current Design Manual. Providing a slightly higher design speed than target speed provides a factor of safety for all users. Chapter 2 includes a lot of guidance on speed management techniques that are to be used in order to achieve target speed. Larry responded that there was extensive discussion and concern with the discrepancy between target and design speeds on Wednesday. A number of CSIT members argue that design speed should conform with target speed, and that in some instances target speed should be even lower than what is included in Table 2-1.

Bryan replied that street layouts is often driven by a variety of factors, which may result in streets that are straight or may not use the minimum curvature or elevations available for design. In those scenarios, design speed is not a good way to control operating speed. The elements that do control speed in those scenarios are narrower lanes and traffic calming measures, neither of which are dependent on design speed.
Bryan noted that different types of sight distance (including stopping, vertical, and horizontal) flow from design speed. It is important that drivers see pedestrians and cyclists and vice-versa. For local streets, target speed and design speed are equal. Larry replied that Designers should not be pushed towards designing more sweeping turns, larger turn radii, wider travel lanes, or providing an auxiliary lane because design speeds are higher.

Chris added that the target speed is the desired operating speed for the road and will also be the posted speed. Using the term design speed does not mean all elements are based on that speed, it is just the assumed speed people might drive. A higher design speed provides extra stopping sight distance which is a good safety element for everyone. Larry asked for confirmation that a higher design speed would not result in a wider roadway, larger turning radius, or provision of auxiliary lanes.

Bryan replied that the street types define the width of the roadway. The need for an auxiliary lane would be determined based on volumes not speed. Bryan shared an aerial of the Merriweather District as an example of how roadway curvature is determined. Street curvature is greater than the minimum curvature required based on the design speed, but street layout is also driven by environmental constraints and the desire for a grid network. Turning radii are driven by the assumed speed of turning vehicles which is much slower than the design speed. Carl suggested adding a note to Table 2-1 stating that the design speed is only used for stopping sight distance or cross-reference the other sections where it is employed. Larry replied that design speed should only be used for stopping sight distance. Bryan noted that minimum horizontal curvature and traffic barrier design are also impacted by design speed.

Christiana expressed concern with the target speed for Neighborhood Connectors, which is set at 35 mph. Bryan replied that a significant number of roads in Howard County are currently signed at 35 mph. The benefit of signing roads for higher speeds is that for longer trips, people use those roads, instead of local streets, which has the benefit of lowering volumes on local streets. Christiana replied that Howard County does not have a grid system which means drivers are often forced to use larger roads regardless of the posted speed. She agreed that speeds should not be as low as 25 mph on Neighborhood Connectors, but 30 mph may be more appropriate in order to increase the safety for all road users.

Bryan noted that Martin Road would be a Neighborhood Street if it were designed now, and Cedar Lane would be a Neighborhood Connector. Christiana replied that Cedar Lane is not a hospitable road for any user. Jenn Biddle commented that if we design a street with target speed equal to design speed it also impacts street runout length. The County may design a hazard that could seriously injure people. Christiana replied that she is convinced that it is appropriate to have a design speed higher than target speed for higher volume roadways, but is interested in lowering the target speed for Neighborhood Connectors. Jenn replied that there are streets all over the County that are the equivalent of Neighborhood Connectors that are signed 35 mph. Signing County streets to a lower speed limit will create inconsistency between County roads and State Roads, which will be confusing for drivers and pedestrians.

Kris Jagarapu added that one take away from Table 2-1 is that the majority of County roadways will be 25 mph, which will essentially become the default speed limit on County roadways moving forward. He acknowledged the concern about Neighborhood Connector speeds but pointed out it is the only street type with a 35 mph target speed.

Larry noted that after all of the discussion, he still does not have a good understanding of how these street types will function and what they will look like. Chris replied that is challenging since none of the roads are designed in this matter. Larry asked if the group could provide any examples of Howard County streets that are similar. Bryan said that is possible, but any examples will not be identical to the proposed street types. Larry suggested demonstrating how existing streets could have been built like the new street types would be helpful. Chad Edmondson agreed and noted that examples from locations outside of Howard County could also be helpful. Kris agreed that it would be helpful for the public to understand how old roads would look if built under the new standards.
Volume IV Detail

Bryan shared that staff met with the Fire Department to discuss the new street types and traffic calming measures. The Fire Code, which requires 20 feet of clearance which allows a vehicle to pass when responding to a fire. The only street type this impacts is the Neighborhood Connector. The concern was addressed by modifying the median detail to allow for a mountable curb with a stabilized median which would allow a fire truck to pass. Larry asked if the Fire Code requires 20 feet of clearance in all locations, or just where there are existing buildings. Bryan replied that the Fire Department is open to specific elements that may narrow to less than 20 feet in a given location. DPW works with the Fire Department on any traffic calming measure on a case by case basis. For example, on Great Star Drive, response vehicles do have to slow significantly to make it through the chicane which impacts response time, but the chicane is not adjacent to a structure and a responding truck would not need to stop while in the chicane. Leah noted that there is language in the Design Manual that notes DPW will coordinate the installation of traffic calming measures with the Fire Department.

Medians

Bryan noted language was added to the median section to allow for the landscaping of medians narrower than six feet in consultation with DPW. In addition, there is no intention to make modifications to existing landscaped medians that are narrower than six feet. Jessica appreciated the flexibility.

Speed Management

Bryan noted that Table 2-12, “Appropriate Speed Management Treatment for New Streets Matrix” and Table 2-13, “Appropriate Speed Management Techniques for Retrofits” have been populated. The first table should be referenced for traffic calming measures that are options for new streets, and the second table should be referenced for traffic calming measures that are appropriate in retrofit situations based on the functional classification of a street.

Minimum Curb Radii for Intersections

Bryan shared that Table 2-20, “Minimum Curb Radius for Intersection” was updated to show minimums instead of a range, and a few streets now show smaller radii. Jennifer White asked whether members of the CSIT would have an opportunity to respond to these revisions during the public comment period. Bruce replied that members of the CSIT can continue to provide comments. Bryan noted that it would be helpful to have additional time to review technical comments if possible. Leah noted the public comment period ends on October 28, which gives the team less than a week to address any necessary revisions. It would be helpful to receive comments from members of the CSIT sooner.

Auxiliary Lanes

Bryan noted the previous version of the Design Manual noted auxiliary lane width would be 12 feet. It has been updated to show that auxiliary lane width should match the width of the adjacent through travel lane.

Turning Lane

Bryan clarified that in most cases where there are channelizing islands, pedestrian access is necessary although there may be exceptions in the rural parts of the county. Larry requested that Figure 2-25 be modified to add a ladder crosswalk to the channelized turn lane graphic.

Crosswalks

Bryan noted language was added to the crosswalks section to address a comment from Jenn Biddle. It is not always appropriate to mark a crosswalk, nor is it required by State law. Larry asked for an example where marking a crosswalk is not appropriate. Jenn answered that in the vicinity of a school, there may be curb ramps at every corner denoting an unmarked crosswalk, but crosswalks may only be marked in the locations where crossing guards are located where children should cross. This also helps regular commuters understand where they can expect children crossing the street. Jenn stated that marked crosswalks can provide a false sense of security to pedestrians. Larry asked whether a pedestrian has the same legal rights in a marked or unmarked crosswalk. Jenn replied that legally a car is supposed to yield and stop if a pedestrian is in a marked or unmarked crosswalk, although that may not always happen.
Larry noted that when crossing a road to stay on a Columbia Association path, cars often do not know they are supposed to stop. Jenn replied that compliance is an issue even with marked crossings. Additionally, not every perceived crossing is a legal crossing. Jessica noted that Columbia Association pathways are frequently not ADA compliant. Chris added that there are locations where marked crossings can be helpful - the issue is how to prioritize which crosswalks get marked. Jeremy Mocny added that the State defines crosswalks as two curb ramps at an intersection, regardless of pavement marking. For example, crosswalks in residential neighborhoods are not marked.

Larry noted he does not support the language as currently written. Carl asked DPW whether the issue of marking crosswalks is similar to why a centerline marking is not provided on neighborhood streets. Kris replied that it is similar. Typically, the County does not mark centerline markings because it promotes speed. Bruce noted changing the sentence order may address Larry’s concern. Bryan added that it is important a pedestrian does not cross to a corner with no safe pedestrian routes or accessible destinations.

**Pedestrian Recall**

Bryan shared there is additional clarification on pedestrian signalization at intersections. The concepts remain the same, although some things have been rephrased and consolidated. Chris thanked DPW for their assistance clarifying this section for practitioners, and the draft represents some ideas OoT has been working to get on paper.

**Figures**

Larry requested that Figure 2-27 and Figure 2-28, images showing a roundabout and mini-roundabout be updated to show what bicycle facilities are supposed to look like. Kris offered to provide updated photos for the next draft. Larry noted Figure 2-24, “Actual Curb Radius and Effective Radius” shows a car encroaching into the path a cyclist would take. Leah located an alternate graphic that shows a parking lane instead of a bike lane that resolved the issue while showing that it is possible to have a tighter curb radius even with a larger effective turning radius. Bryan noted that Figure 2-15 showing an example of a raised center median island was updated per Larry’s request at the last CSIT meeting.

**Design Manual Posting for Public Comment**

Bruce presented a draft statement from the CSIT that could be posted with the draft Design Manual for public comment. The goal is to share the Design Manual as a work in progress that is being released for public comment, that will be further strengthened by public feedback. Carl asked whether the language “vulnerable users” should be changed to “all users.” Larry noted that the revised Design Manual is making an improvement in how Howard County accommodates the most vulnerable users. Kris suggested calling the “most vulnerable users” “bicyclists and pedestrians.” Leah noted that language could be perceived as exclusive of persons with disabilities, children, and the elderly. Bruce suggested changing the language to, “to accommodate all users, with an increase emphasis on equity and the most vulnerable users.” Jennifer motioned to accept the statement with noted edits for posting along with the Design Manual. Sam Sidh seconded the motion, and the CSIT approved the statement unanimously.

**Schedule review**

Bryan noted that the public comment period will end on Thursday, October 28, 2021. The next CSIT meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 3, 2021. The finished version of the presentation for the first public workshop will be distributed by Tuesday, October 12, 2021. Leah recommended the CSIT provide comments on the draft Design Manual by Friday, October 22, 2021.

Larry expressed concern with not having another CSIT meeting until November 3 and requested an additional meeting to discuss public feedback. Bruce suggested scheduling an additional meeting on Wednesday, October 27. Bryan agreed with the proposed date, and suggested meeting from 3:00-5:00 pm.

**Next Steps**

Jennifer asked whether the CSIT has the most up to date draft of the Design Manual. Leah replied that the CSIT will be provided copies of the Design Manual that will be posted for public review.
Carl Gutschick asked if the flyers for the workshops and survey that were provided a few weeks ago were still accurate, and Chris affirmed they are accurate.

Action items from this meeting include:

- WRA to distribute draft Design Manual to CSIT for review
- County to post draft Design Manual on website for Public Comment
- WRA to distribute public workshop presentation to CSIT for review by Tuesday, October 12
- CSIT to provide comments on draft Design Manual by October 22
- WRA to schedule an interim CSIT meeting for Wednesday, October 27, 3:00-5:00 pm

Leah Kacanda, AICP