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Introduction, roll call, agenda review

Chris Eatough introduced Abdul Akbari from the Department of Public Works (DPW) Transportation and Special Projects Division to the Complete Streets Implementation Team (CSIT). Abdul has been assisting in addressing public and CSIT comments. Bryan Townsend welcomed all attendees and reviewed the agenda, and then led the group through the materials attached to these minutes. He noted this was a supplemental CSIT meeting scheduled to discuss comments from the team and the public workshops.

Review of Workshop Q&A

Chris provided a summary of the public workshops that were held on Thursday, October 14 and Thursday, October 21. There were 16 attendees at the first workshop which was an introduction to Design Manual revisions, and 43 at the second which had a more technical focus. Attendance numbers exclude staff and consultants. The videos for each workshop are available on the Design Manual updates website. Chris noted that the public comment period is open until Thursday, October 28. He asked CSIT members to encourage their contacts to submit their comments. Q&A documents addressing questions received at each workshop will be posted to the website.

Jennifer White asked Chris to identify any changes or revisions made to the Design Manual that were explicitly in response to comments from the public. Bryan replied that no revisions have been made at this time in response to public comments, however, based on a preliminary assessment of comments received from the CSIT, around 50 comments will be addressed during revisions.

First Workshop Q&A

Chris noted that the Transportation Improvement Prioritization System (TIPS) is currently included as an appendix to Chapter 1 of the Design Manual. Several comments received from the public related to the TIPS process. The County is open to suggestions on how to improve the process. Additional language may be added to indicate that the TIPS process is still evolving and has not yet been finalized.

Bryan noted one member of the public expressed interest in not further narrowing the width of motor vehicle lanes, especially regarding the Oakland Mills Road project. The team clarified that the lane widths on Oakland Mills Road are remaining the same. Revisions to the Design Manual are not necessary to address each comment.

Bryan noted that there was a question about how right-of-way limitations impact which roads can be improved in the County and the role eminent domain plays. The response to this question clarified the process the County goes through to obtain right-of-way for transportation projects. The County prefers to work with property owners on acquisition as opposed to using eminent domain.

Chris shared that another comment related to education and monitoring. He acknowledged that educating people on how to safely navigate new street types and features will be important, but that is not a topic addressed within the Design Manual. The County will rely on community partners to conduct education and outreach activities. Monitoring is another issue that is not addressed by the Design Manual.
Bryan noted there was a question about how “earth-friendly” features are incorporated into Howard County Streets. The street types all have a sizable permeable buffer. The Design Manual also speaks to the goal of preserving existing trees wherever possible.

Bryan shared there were a few questions that related to the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO), which is not being addressed at this time. Updates to APFO, which will also impact Volume III Chapter 4 will be conducted by an APFO committee in consideration of other updates to the general plan.

Larry Schoen asked whether the County has ever been successful in acquiring property to increase right-of-way or improve an intersection. Chris replied the county regularly acquires right-of-way to complete transportation projects. Larry asked if the current process is voluntary. Chris replied that the process involves a negotiation with the property owner. Larry observed that may result in an issue if they will not entertain an offer, and then the County is not willing to use the eminent domain process. Tom Auyeung replied that most capital projects require land acquisition. Some projects may have a 5-6 year delay before right-of-way is received. He estimated 70%-80% of the time the County can get the right-of-way required. The County offers fair market value and explains the need for the project to the property owner. Most property owners are understanding and willing to work with the County, although there have been a few unsuccessful cases. Over the past twenty years, Tom is not familiar with a County project which has used eminent domain.

**Second Workshop Q&A**

Bryan walked through the questions received during the second workshop.

Bryan noted one question asked whether sidewalks would be provided in conjunction with traffic circles. Sidewalks will be provided where sidewalks currently exist or are planned. In rural areas, there may be circumstances where sidewalks are not provided.

Bryan shared that one attendee asked how the County is preparing to handle traffic that gets worse because of Complete Streets improvements. The County will have to consider trade-offs, such as the removal of auxiliary lanes to incorporate multimodal improvements, but generally, slower speeds do not necessarily result in declining vehicle throughput. The new Design Manual makes clear that the word “traffic” is about all modes of travel, not just motor vehicles.

Bryan noted the team received a question asking why design speed does not equal target speed. The response during the workshop was lengthy. A more concise response was provided in the Q&A document. Despite the best efforts of the designer, operating speeds for a minority of users may be higher than the target speed. That is why the design speed is slightly higher.

Bryan shared another question about education was received that asks whether there was a plan to educate younger cyclists. Chris replied educating youth would also be done in conjunction with community partners, and that Howard County Public School System (HCPSS) would be a natural partner in this effort.

Bruce observed that a lot of questions received from the public had a lot in common with questions and comments from CSIT members. Therefore, edits that are being made in response to CSIT comments will also address public concerns. He asked that if members of the CSIT have an outstanding concern that has not yet been provided as a comment to let staff know. Outside of the comments from the public on the TIPS process, no new issues have been raised via the public process.

Jennifer asked Bruce to explain how responses to questions received will be communicated to the public. She observed that the Q&A documents show a clear question and answer, but a number of these issues may require additional thought or discussion. The preamble of the draft Design Manual indicated that revisions would incorporate public feedback.
Bruce replied that the review of the CSIT comment log might shed some light on some of those issues. Several comments were provided by Larry and Jennifer, as well as some other members of the Multimodal Transportation Board (MTB). The CSIT comment log includes responses to those issues and indicates which issues will be addressed with revisions or responded to otherwise.

Jessica Bellah asked when CSIT members should provide comments on the Q&A documents. Bruce requested comments by Thursday, October 28 if possible.

**Review of Public Comments**

Bryan shared that the County has not received a lot of public feedback from the survey form to date. Two of the surveys receive reflect responses that were also provided to the CSIT via Larry last week, so those comments appear in both the public comment log and the CSIT comment log. Bryan provided a brief overview of the public comment log attached to these minutes.

Bryan noted that several comments received asked about the process that will be used to revise the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO), and Chapter 4 of Volume III, Adequate Transportation Facilities Test Evaluation Requirements. Larry noted that the CSIT has worked very long and hard on revisions to Volume III and asked that it be clarified that if there are any contradictions among the chapters, the strictest requirement should apply. More lenient requirements that appear in Chapter 4, which is not being revised at this time, should not supersede requirements in Chapter 5. He asked for clarification from the Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ) on how developers use the two chapters.

Bryan replied that the team reviewed the chapters to check for contradictions and address them when found. Larry noted that a potential response to the Chapter 4 comments raised by the public is to note that Chapter 4 will be updated in the future, but Designers still must comply with the other chapters of the Design Manual.

Bruce replied that staff needs to determine how to phrase that requirement. With respect to Chapter 4, some members of the public did not want the County to address it at all because they thought changes were being made in secret. In fact, the County will be going through a more public process for changes to APFO.

**Review of CSIT Comments**

Bruce thanked Larry and Jennifer for their diligent efforts in reviewing the draft Design Manual and providing comments. He noted that 65-70 comments are still under review, and several do not require any changes, but 40-50 can be addressed. The County may have difficulty addressing 20 of the comments based on prior agreement or other policy. The goal is to prepare a response to each comment to share with the group, which will be available at the next CSIT meeting. The CSIT has been provided with all comments received.

Bryan provided an overview of the CSIT Comment Log, which is attached to these minutes. Bryan asked if any members have any thoughts on the APFO process. Jennifer White replied that she has been in touch with Bruce regarding the role of APFO and the Design Manual. The Design Manual is a standard, and we have discussed that in some instances it may need to be revised after reviewing the subdivision regulations and APFO. It is important that these documents are consistent. It would be helpful to get a sense of the overarching goals for other updates that will aid in prefiling the draft Design Manual in December. It would also be helpful to have a sense of the County’s timeline, so that it is possible to make the necessary changes in Chapter 4 and 5. How much time is necessary to ensure that substantive changes can be made?

Bruce replied that the County administration has a legislative mandate, and the goal is to deliver a Design Manual to County Council that complies with the Complete Streets policy within the designated timeline. He clarified that the County is working to be responsive to comments received and continue to improve the draft Design Manual, but the document does need to be finalized for Council. The County is open to formally acknowledging some of the broader principles that will influence revisions moving forward.
Christiana Rigby asked when the subdivision regulations are going to be updated. Sam Sidh replied that the County does not currently have an appetite to delay updates any further. There are other major legislative items that are being pursued early next year including the adoption of HoCo By Design in January and February. It would be preferable to keep those items separated. Throughout this process the CSIT has been working in good faith, trying to meet deadlines while accommodating as much feedback as possible.

Christiana agreed that there is a large legislative load coming towards Council in 2022. The general plan will consume January through March and the budget will consume April and May. Looking at the Council’s workload it would be best to stick with the current timeline. She noted she is less concerned with the timeline than the product. Many Council member’s perception is that this document will be focused on all modes. The current draft of the Design Manual is still focused on cars and other modes. That is a bigger sticking point than the timeline. Different people are approaching this issue from different perspectives. If the CSIT does not deliver a product that is more than “cars and,” the Council may look at amendments. She encouraged CSIT members to be cognizant of the legislative process. Bruce acknowledged that the draft Design Manual will be reviewed by Council and changes could happen during the legislative process.

Larry asked Christiana to point out some critical issues that would make this document more than “cars and” for some of the Council members. Christiana replied that she is not approaching the Design Manual from a traffic engineer’s perspective. She noted that cars do not have to push a button to get a traffic signals, but per the current Design Manual, pedestrians do. She also expressed concern with the manual limiting the use of Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPI), in the downtown area. A bigger issue is how the County balances motor vehicle capacity and the safety of all road users. The background growth rate is also a concern.

Bruce noted that the Design Manual is limited as a tool since it cannot place requirements on developers. Those changes must be pursued via the regulatory process. The CS policy allows for nine months to address the subdivision regulations. The capital budget will also have to include sufficient funding to make improvements. Bruce acknowledged the issues Christiana raised, but noted that implementing Complete Streets will also require investment and other regulatory changes.

Chris noted that substantial Changes are not being made to Chapter 4 at this time beyond the accuracy correction of the background growth rate. Changes to Chapter 4 will be done by an APFO committee on a different timeline. Christiana expressed concern that once APFO is changed there will be reluctance to change the Design Manual. Bruce replied that that issue could be addressed in the resolution accompanying the Design Manual. Christiana noted that the process for Chapter 4 revisions should be specified now to avoid disagreement moving forward. Bruce agreed, observing issues now are a result of not outlining the process in greater detail when the Complete Streets policy was adopted.

Sam agreed that it is possible to clarify the timelines for updating APFO and the subdivision regulations. He noted APFO is also required to be updated within one year of the approval of the general plan. For that reason, it is also important to get the general plan through the legislative process in a timely fashion. Incremental progress is ok, and the administration is happy to have conversations around prioritizing certain issues.

Jessica noted that she has not yet been through an update to APFO and asked whether the County provides any professional resources or expertise to the committee charged with APFO updates. The committee will have to think about traffic in very different terms than in the past due to the Complete Streets policy. APFO is very car-centric now. The APFO committee should have the Complete Streets policy and Design Manual in hand to guide their discussions and recommendations.

Sam clarified that he has not been through an APFO revision process either. He suggested there is benefit to having something concrete advanced on the Complete Streets side that can be incorporated into the APFO review process.

Larry noted that Chapter 4 gives guidelines for a study pursuant to the APFO requirements of the subdivision regulations. The CSIT worked hard to get some additional study requirements into Chapter 5, including connectivity to schools, libraries, and parks. These changes do not put capital requirements on a developer, just study requirements.
The concern is that a developer would just go to Chapter 4 and ignore the requirements in Chapter 5. Just including language that clarifies other sections of the Design Manual (beyond Chapter 4) have requirements would satisfy this concern.

Chris asked Chad Edmondson whether a developer follows Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 when going through the APFO process. Chad replied complying with APFO does not excuse them from going through the other chapters. APFO is required if 5 peak hours or greater are generated. Chapter 5 is clear that all other studies are also required. A developer must meet the requirements of Chapter 4 and address Chapter 5. Each chapter stands on its own.

Larry agreed that both chapters should stand on their own, noting that was the goal of reviewing Chapters 2 and 5 to ensure there is not any duplication or lack of clarity between the two chapters. He noted that same review has not been done for Chapters 4 and 5. In place of a full review, additional clarification could be provided by adding language to Chapter 4 that Chapter 5 is also required.

Carl noted that even under the current Design Manual, there are times when a project must do both Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 even though it is not specified in either chapter. Revisions to Chapter 5 have increased the types and numbers of study, and no where does it state if you meet one you don't have to meet the other. Larry noted the information is helpful and asked that this response be included in the CSIT Comment Log. He asked whether Chapter 4 also puts requirements on a developer to implement improvements. Carl responded that sometimes the results of the APFO study and traffic study may require improvements.

Jessica added that a note that Chapter 4 will be updated would be helpful. Whenever zoning regulations are reviewed it is pretty apparent when a section has been updated. Is it possible to indicate which chapters have been updated as result of the Complete Streets policy and which have not? By not amending the introduction to Chapter 4, it may imply that it has already been fully reviewed.

Bruce asked Chris to provide some feedback on the section of the Design Manual regarding vertical elements outside of the travel way. The section is intended to refer to things like signs, and street trees, but the commentor was concerned that this section would also prohibit vertical elements within the roadway such as flex posts. Bryan noted the section would be revised to clarify the intent.

Bryan noted another comment requested that midblock street narrowing be allowed on more street types. There are two types of midblock street narrowing, one-lane, like on Brandon’s Way and two-lane like on Martin Road. One-lane and two-lane street narrowing may be handled differently. Larry noted a related concern, which is that there should be a way for a person on a bike to pass around that narrowing. He noted similar language is used elsewhere in the Design Manual and asked that it be included throughout the traffic calming measures section. Chris agreed that there is language that traffic calming elements shall not interrupt bicycle facilities, but it may need to be included in more than one location.

Bryan noted that there were comments received regarding minimum intersection spacing. This may have to correlate to the new street types instead of functional classification, as the former applies to new developments and the latter applies to intersections with streets.

Bryan noted there are also outstanding concerns about the minimum curvature for turning movements. The team has used AutoTURN to establish the minimum curvatures listed but will take another look based on the comments received.

Bryan shared that several comments were received on the auxiliary lane section. Larry asked that it be clearly stated that auxiliary lanes should be minimized. Chris replied that the current draft states they should be minimized, followed by guidance about where they should be used.
Larry replied that “shall” is still used regarding the provision of auxiliary lanes, asking why the strongest language possible is being used when they are also to be minimized to the extent possible. The tone of the entire paragraph is an example of how this Design Manual is car-centric. Auxiliary lanes at intersections are a big deal because they cause vehicles to move faster and decrease the available space for other modes of travel. Bryan replied that the team will take another look at the language to better balance considerations for different modes of travel.

Bryan noted that traffic islands are also discouraged, but the draft language provides a lot of detail on design in instances where they are appropriate. Traffic islands can provide refuge for pedestrians. The primary concern from commentors is that channelizing islands can result in high speeds, but strategies are provided to lower those speeds. Larry noted one comment also referenced a good document from Massachusetts DOT, and recommended it be incorporated.

Bryan shared that several CSIT members expressed concern about language stating marked crosswalks are not appropriate in some instances. Christiana noted that often, locations are deemed inappropriate for a marked crosswalk because speeds are too high. She noted it makes sense when crosswalks are not appropriate proximate to sharp turns where lines of sight are limited, but the goal should be to slow down cars before the crossing point so that it is safe to cross. She asked that the language address the nuance needed to evaluate crossing locations.

Jenn Biddle noted that the placement of marked crosswalks depends on sight distance and motor vehicle speed. Pavement markings do not protect pedestrians, and often can give them a false sense of security. Additionally, selectively marking crosswalks can provide indications regarding the preferred routes for crossing, especially for safe routes to school. For example, in a neighborhood where there are a lot of curb ramps with unmarked crosswalks, marked crosswalks are deployed at designated school crossings to encourage students to cross at certain locations. Drivers may pay attention to the first crosswalk but not the second of third. Marked crosswalks can channelize where students walk. In Maple Lawn or commercial districts this principle is also applicable. It is important to have pedestrians cross at certain locations to minimize conflict points without forcing people to walk too far out of their way to cross the street.

Jeremy Mocny noted that the language in the draft provides guidance in subdivisions where there is low density development. A legal crossing is created when there are curb ramps from the sidewalk to a street. The legal crossing does not automatically trigger a marked crosswalk.

Bryan moved on to the section on pedestrian recall. Chris noted the section says the use of pedestrian recall must be approved by DPW since they oversee all signalization. In general, the language for recall creates it as the default situation at the minor leg of signalized intersections where it will not impact signal length. For major legs it is not the default because recall would impact signal length even if a pedestrian does not need to make the crossing.

Bryan noted that that additional language has been added to clarify a conflict in the text about right turn on red restrictions. Bus turnout lanes should not be the default, and the text on floating bus stops will be amended to reflect that.

Bryan noted an additional comment requested a tool for the public to navigate and understand the requirements of the Design Manual as well as changes to future regulations such as the subdivision regulations.

Chris noted that it is important to not overload the exceptions process. Larry replied that there could be a less onerous process he referred to as “exceptions light.” If there is a need to say something is not practical or feasible it shouldn’t relate to pedestrian and bicycle safety issues. The general tone of the Design Manual is that those things are considered amenities instead of necessary features. Bryan noted he would review the draft Design Manual accordingly.

Bryan noted there is language stating that bike lanes are not to end at intersections. Chris noted it is impossible to provide protected bicycle facilities at every intersection in Howard County. Larry replied that the Design Manual is a design guide not a capital funding guide. If a new intersection is under construction that features a protected bicycle facility, it should not be unprotected at the intersection. Chris agreed with Larry’s statement, but noted that is not what
the comment reads. Larry referenced the Massachusetts DOT Separated Bike Lane Planning and Design Guide, which has an entire chapter on intersections, and recommended that it be incorporated. Chris replied that the team put a lot of effort into intersection analysis to see what works and doesn’t work. Endorsing an entire external design guide requires the County to be comfortable with all of its contents, including updates that may be made. Larry replied an entire roadway system should not be designed for a large design vehicle. Bryan noted that there are limited places where Designers must design for the largest vehicles. The current language attempts to strike a balance by using a control vehicle.

Bryan noted a section was added on bicycle signal heads. Larry noted that if the County values trip reduction, particularly in Downtown Columbia, they should change signal timing to reduce the wait time for a pedestrian to get the walk signal. At intersections like Vantage Point Road and Little Patuxent Parkway, having a bicycle push button could actually reduce the cycle length relative to a bicyclist using the pedestrian push button.

Bryan shared several comments were received regarding the ten foot standard width of shared use paths as too narrow. He noted the draft recommends Designers use the shared use path calculator to determine when a larger width is appropriate.

Schedule review

Bryan asked CSIT members to reach out if they have any additional comments. The next CSIT meetings will be used to discuss how these comments can be incorporated into revisions. Bruce noted that staff will be briefing the Public Works Board at the November 9 meeting. All outstanding comments will need to be addressed before that meeting so that they have a current draft to review.

Next Steps

The next CSIT meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 3 at 3:00pm.

Action items from this meeting include:

- CSIT members are to provide WRA with any additional comments
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