Respondent #1

Q4 What is your interest in the Design Manual? [Please answer the one(s) that align(s) closest to your interest.]

Interested member of the public
Member of community organization with special interest in transportation

Q5 Which elements of the County transportation system are you interested in?

Pedestrian system, including sidewalks, crosswalks, etc.
Bicycle facilities, including bike lanes, pathways, etc., Transit system,
Road system

Q6 Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 1 - Introduction and General Information? Please include section number (e.g., 1.2, 1.3) and/or page number in your response.

1-3 3. This is critical, and could be more consistently applied throughout the manual. [comments to follow.]

1-3 D. Fully agree in principle, however, with respect to cycling, a greater emphasis needs to be placed on connectivity from those tracts to tracts in which there are employment, shopping, and educational destinations.

1-6 C. Prioritization as implemented in TIPS needs fine tuning: For cycling projects, need to give more weight to connectivity between tracts with high VPI to tracts with lower VPI to improve access to jobs and amenities. Also consider scaling the Equity measure linearly (VPI3 = 3 points, 4 = 4 points, etc.). With respect to crash history, given that there are few cyclists and therefore few incidents, cycling infrastructure needs to be prioritized based on other measures of safety than crashes, such as LTS. I'll have more to say about these points later, either in this survey or another.

1-8 #2: Given the lack of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, there may be little pedestrian or bicycle activity in the area of a project. Therefore it is likely that many project managers will be able to say that there is no current need for infrastructure--a self-fulfilling prophecy. I would eliminate this justification altogether. Development and capital projects should always incorporate complete streets.

1-11 A boulevard, as a four-lane street, poses high risks to pedestrians at uncontrolled crossings. (One car stops, another goes around, hitting the pedestrian). The definition of Boulevard should include "controlled crosswalks" as a feature. Also, the 25-mph target speed is, um, optimistic.
Would that it were possible!

1-12 Town Center connector: Definition should incorporate pedestrian refuge islands in mid-block crossings.

1-14 Parkway: a) Need to describe pedestrian crossing features. b) Parkways are likely to be commuting routes for cyclists. A shared use path that is only 10’ wide will likely disincentivize commuting for some, others will stay on the street.

1-15 Neighborhood connector: See comment b) on parkways above regarding commuters. 1-20 Industrial Street. Same comment on commuters

1-16 1-25 "Anticipated Traffic Volumes at an acceptable level of service": Anticipated traffic volumes need to be reasonably calculated, not by applying some constant inflation figure regardless of context

1-26 These are good. A general comment: A center line on a shared use pathway, especially a narrow one, may both decrease conflicts and provide for safer passing by encouraging pedestrians to stay to one side.

1-27 parallel routes: I might use language like "more convenient alternate routes", because, especially in Columbia, the path network often enable cyclists to complete trips from point A to point B faster than motorists. Putting paths on the road would not be an improvement!

Appendix B p 3: Access to Community Facilities: Pedestrians and cyclists have different ranges and need to be treated differently. I suggest: Pedestrian facilities within 1/4 mile and/or bicycling facilities within 1/2 mile: 4 points, Pedestrian facilities within 1/2 mile and/or bicycling facilities within 1 mile: 3 points, Bicycling facilities within 5 miles: 1 point

Appendix B p 4 Equity: VPI should be linearly related, e.g., the difference between VPI 5 and VPI 6 should not be 5 points. You could do VPI <2: 0 points, VPI 3: 3 points, VPI 4: 4 points, VPI 5: 5 points, etc. Also consider adding a bonus point system for connecting low VPI areas to regional resources such as libraries, regional parks, community centers, village centers, social service centers, health care facilities, government centers, & employment centers
Appendix B p 4 Crash history: This will be sparse for pedestrians and cyclists. Can we consider other metrics, such as high LTS intersections with existing bike facilities?

Appendix B p 4 Maintenance: Recommend a default score for separate sidewalk/bike path infrastructure that recognizes relatively lower maintenance costs.

Q7

Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 2 - Street Design? Please include section number (e.g., 2.2, 2.3) and/or page number in your response.

2-33ff: In the sections on curb extensions, midblock narrows, and chicanes, please consider explicitly requiring that when road width permits, cyclists be provided a through path like shown in Figure 2-19, vs. being forced into traffic as shown in Figure 2-16, especially for high LTS roads.

2-45 G. Should include the same setbacks for shared use paths and bicycle paths in addition to roads!

2-66 Channelized right turn lanes (“slip lanes”). I suggest REQUIRING painted ladder style crosswalks, requiring that non-turning cyclist traffic be provided a means to get over to the left some distance before the slip lane, and requiring that right turning cyclists be safely accommodated, perhaps by their own slip lane!

2-72 Curb ramps: Curb ramps and ladder style crosswalks should be provided to enable pedestrians to safely reach any corner of an intersection adjacent to a bus stop.

2-73: Pedestrian recall should be REQUIRED at all signalized crosswalks

2-77 It would be good to see a graphic showing a well-designed intersection with a slip lane. Include green colored pavement for two-way separated bike lanes at intersections.

2-82 e. Suggest treating bike lanes across commercial / high volume driveways the same way. Suggest using the word “Shall” throughout

2-82 7. A suggestion: For intersections where pedestrian pushbuttons provide long walk signal durations (such as 35 seconds for LPP at Vantage Point Road) where pedestrian recall can’t be provided due to the insufficient length of the walk signal, a cyclist pushbutton that just operates the normal cycle would help reduce congestion on the busy legs of the intersection.
Q8 What is your feedback on Volume III, Chapter 3 - Design of Bridges, Retaining Walls, and Small Structures? Please include section number (e.g., 3.2, 3.3) and/or page number in your response.

Respondent skipped this question

Q9

Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 4 - Adequate Road Facilities Test Evaluation Requirements? Please include section number (e.g., 4.2, 4.3) and/or page number in your response.

4-3 This growth rate is quite high, especially compounded, especially for areas that are already well-developed. It also does not take into consideration the growth in cycling that will occur if the Complete Streets criteria are successful, particularly in high density areas.

4-15 Does traffic monitoring include pedestrians and bicycles?

Otherwise, how will success be quantified?

4-16 4.9.5 The Cordon line really needs to include Bridge Columbia!

4-18 Free Right—these should be discouraged and certainly no benefit should accrue to including them in an analysis

Q10

Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 5 - Multimodal Traffic Studies? Please include section number (e.g., 5.2, 5.3) and/or page number in your response.

5-8 1. There is a sentence crossed out that should not be crossed out. There are lots of paths in Columbia that cross mid-block and are avoided because there are no ramps and/or the road is stressful to cross (e.g., the path from Wilde Lake to Swansfield Pool and the hospital across Harpers Farm Road)

5-9 2. Pedestrian/cyclist overpasses and underpasses are also and perhaps most strongly, warranted, to provide a crossing for commuting cyclists across a significant barrier (such as I-95 or the Patuxent River) which cannot be crossed without a long detour, and/or to provide an alternative crossing to a busy intersection (e.g., Sabo Bridge in Minneapolis)

5-10 The LTS methodology is a good start and appropriately conservative. It needs to consider intersections with left turning traffic. The “prevailing speed” definition should NOT permit posted speed to be used in any event. Posted +10 mph, maybe…
Q11
Do you have feedback on Volume IV, typical cross sections and details? Please include detail number (found in the lower right corner) in your response.

Respondent skipped this question

Q12
How did you inform yourself about the changes in the Design Manual? (Please check all that apply)

I attended Workshop #1 - Introduction to the HC Complete Streets Design Manual - on October 14 (or watched the recording)

I attended Workshop #2 - Technical Overview to the HC Complete Streets Design Manual - on October 21 (or watched the recording)

I reviewed the draft Design Manual myself online.
Respondent #2

Q4

What is your interest in the Design Manual? [Please answer the one(s) that align(s) closest to your interest.]

Interested member of the public,
Member of community organization with special interest in transportation,

Q5

Which elements of the County transportation system are you interested in?

Pedestrian system, including sidewalks, crosswalks, etc.
Bicycle facilities, including bike lanes, pathways, etc., Transit system,
Road system
Q6
Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 1 - Introduction and General Information? Please include section number (e.g., 1.2, 1.3) and/or page number in your response.

I appreciate the new street typology that acknowledges that street design should be compatible and supportive of adjacent land uses (previous street typologies resulted in wide, fast streets in the past) – see Chapter 1, starting on page 1-10. I appreciate the new street cross-sections that incorporate higher quality pedestrian and bicycle accommodations, including sidewalks, shared use pathways, and separated bike lanes – starting on pages 1-11. It is really good to see complete streets design is incorporated throughout all parts of the manual instead of in separate chapters, which sends a clear message that pedestrians, people with mobility challenges, bicyclists and transit users should be incorporated into every aspect of street and bridge design.

Q7
Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 2 - Street Design? Please include section number (e.g., 2.2, 2.3) and/or page number in your response.

The Complete Streets policy requires both the Design Manual and the Subdivision regulations to be revised. Both documents should revise background traffic growth projections and should adopt vehicle-miles-travelled (VMT) instead of LOS as a principle metric for evaluating traffic impacts of development. There is no reason to continue detrimental policies in the Design Manual simply because the Subdivision regulations have not yet been revised. The Design Manual should be corrected now.

Q8
What is your feedback on Volume III, Chapter 3 - Design of Bridges, Retaining Walls, and Small Structures? Please include section number (e.g., 3.2, 3.3) and/or page number in your response.

Respondent skipped this question

Q9
Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 4 - Adequate Road Facilities Test Evaluation Requirements? Please include section number (e.g., 4.2, 4.3) and/or page number in your response.

Target speeds for Neighborhood street types and Town Center streets should be lowered to 20 mph, and target speed and design speed should be the same for all street types, in accordance with national guidance.
Q10
Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 5 - Multimodal Traffic Studies? Please include section number (e.g., 5.2, 5.3) and/or page number in your response.

Q11
Do you have feedback on Volume IV, typical cross sections and details? Please include detail number (found in the lower right corner) in your response.

Q12
How did you inform yourself about the changes in the Design Manual? (Please check all that apply)

I reviewed the draft Design Manual myself online.

Respondent skipped this question
Respondent #3

Q4
What is your interest in the Design Manual? [Please answer the one(s) that align(s) closest to your interest.]

Interested member of the public,
Member of community organization
with special interest in transportation

Q5
Which elements of the County transportation system are you interested in?

Pedestrian system, including sidewalks, crosswalks, etc.

Bicycle facilities, including bike lanes, pathways, etc.

Road system

Q6
Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 1 - Introduction and General Information? Please include section number (e.g., 1.2, 1.3) and/or page number in your response.

Pages 1-18 & 1-19. Neighborhood Streets

Neighborhood Street’s speeds should be less than 20 mph. Cars that hit people going 25 MPH or more usually end in fatalities. Also, centerlines should be removed from neighborhood streets. “When a street loses its centerline, speeds drop approximately 7 mph.” Walkable City Rules, Jeff Speck, p 168.

Q7
Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 2 - Street Design? Please include section number (e.g., 2.2, 2.3) and/or page number in your response.

Page 2-45 Street Trees

The county just planted a Gingko tree (a native Chinese tree) as a street tree in my yard. Street trees should be native, preferably oaks. Quotes from The Nature of Oaks, by Douglas Tallamy:

“Oaks produce enormous root systems over their lifetimes, and these help make them champions when it comes to solid stabilization, carbon sequestration, and watershed management.” Page 10
“Oaks support more forms of life and more fascinating interactions than any other tree genus in North America.” Page 12

“Deep-rooted oaks like this northern red oak (Quercus rubra) will not lift up your sidewalk, driveway, or roadway, even if planted right next to them.” Page 46

**Q8** What is your feedback on Volume III, Chapter 3 - Design of Bridges, Retaining Walls, and Small Structures? Please include section number (e.g., 3.2, 3.3) and/or page number in your response.

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q9** Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 4 - Adequate Road Facilities Test Evaluation Requirements? Please include section number (e.g., 4.2, 4.3) and/or page number in your response.

**Respondent skipped this question**
Q10
Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 5 - Multimodal Traffic Studies? Please include section number (e.g., 5.2, 5.3) and/or page number in your response.

5.2.D
LTS1 Connections

“Designers will strive to provide LTS1 connections to count schools, county parks and county libraries within half a mile of the project…”. Page 5-10 (Section 5.2.D)

I question this distance. Elementary and middle schoolers living within 1 mile of school must walk, while high schoolers must walk within 1.5 miles. I recommend changing this to One and a half miles.

Q11
Do you have feedback on Volume IV, typical cross sections and details? Please include detail number (found in the lower right corner) in your response.

Respondent skipped this question

Q12
How did you inform yourself about the changes in the Design Manual? (Please check all that apply)

I attended Workshop #1 - Introduction to the HC Complete Streets Design Manual - on October 14 (or watched the recording)

I attended Workshop #2 - Technical Overview to the HC Complete Streets Design Manual - on October 21 (or watched the recording)

I reviewed the draft Design Manual myself online.
Respondent #4

Q4
What is your interest in the Design Manual? [Please answer the one(s) that align(s) closest to your interest.]

Member of community organization with special interest in transportation

Q5
Which elements of the County transportation system are you interested in?

Pedestrian system, including sidewalks, crosswalks, etc.

Bicycle facilities, including bike lanes, pathways, etc., Transit system,

Road system

Q6
Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 1 - Introduction and General Information? Please include section number (e.g., 1.2, 1.3) and/or page number in your response.

Respondent skipped this question

Q7
Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 2 - Street Design? Please include section number (e.g., 2.2, 2.3) and/or page number in your response.

I noticed this quote appears frequently in response to major questions pertaining to street design, bike and pedestrian concerns. At what time can the public readdress these items? "These comments will be considered, but not in the timeframe of the current Design Manual updates. Revising these items in light of both the new Complete Streets Design Standards to be considered by County Council in January 2022 and the updated General Plan (HoCoBy Design) scheduled for consideration in early 2022 will allow the County to provide a more comprehensive update. A specific path forward for updating the subdivision regulations and APFO will be addressed in the next 6-month report County Council."

Q8
What is your feedback on Volume III, Chapter 3 - Design of Bridges, Retaining Walls, and Small Structures? Please include section number (e.g., 3.2, 3.3) and/or page number in your response.

Respondent skipped this question
Q9
Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 4 - Adequate Road Facilities Test Evaluation Requirements? Please include section number (e.g., 4.2, 4.3) and/or page number in your response.

Respondent skipped this question

Q10 Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 5 - Multimodal Traffic Studies? Please include section number (e.g., 5.2, 5.3) and/or page number in your response.

Respondent skipped this question

Q11
Do you have feedback on Volume IV, typical cross sections and details? Please include detail number (found in the lower right corner) in your response.

Respondent skipped this question

Q12
How did you inform yourself about the changes in the Design Manual? (Please check all that apply)
I attended Workshop #2 - Technical Overview to the HC Complete Streets Design Manual - on October 21 (or watched the recording)

I reviewed the draft Design Manual myself online.
Respondent #5

Q4
What is your interest in the Design Manual? [Please answer the one(s) that align(s) closest to your interest.]

Interested member of the public

Q5
Which elements of the County transportation system are you interested in?

Pedestrian system, including sidewalks, crosswalks, etc.

Bicycle facilities, including bike lanes, pathways, etc. Transit system

Q6
Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 1 - Introduction and General Information? Please include section number (e.g., 1.2, 1.3) and/or page number in your response.

- Cover page, section titled "What is 'Complete Streets'?", typo. There is a missing opening quotation mark in the first sentence, presumably before the word "to". [This needs to be changed on all the cover pages]

- Section C.2 listing benefits. "Quality of life" is listed as a bullet point, but does not have a parallel summary sentence or descriptive summary. Was this on purpose? Or a typo?

- Section C.3. Consider adding the words in brackets: "Reducing excessive motor vehicle speeds on streets where vulnerable users are likely [to be?] will be considered a net benefit to the community" [After having read the next section, it looks like this wording was intentional, but I had to read it four times before I understood what it was trying to say; the next section reads smoothly, though, perhaps because of the comma]

Section 1.2.C on prioritization. A question on prioritization: I agree that need is far and away the most important criterion for deciding where projects go. However, a secondary factor to consider is prioritizing projects in the walking radius of schools wider than just the ¼ and ½ mile radius outlined in the prioritization scoring system, for a few reasons: (1) the county can take advantage of Safe Route to School matching funds from the federal government, giving us a discount for installing infrastructure that, realistically, will benefit more than just schoolchildren. (2) While people do not necessarily work within walking or bicycling distance of their work, students are commuting daily to their geographically assigned schools for the majority of the calendar year. It’s a flow of human traffic that is therefore easier to predict and easier to plan for. (3) Because schools are where much of our voting takes place, prioritizing schools also literally makes it easier for people to vote, especially those who do not have cars (this is assuming, of course, that the primary consideration
remains areas where there are higher levels of need). And finally, (4) if the county were to intentionally focus on proactively eliminating hazard busing across the county, schools could direct money spent annually on hazard busing to other more pressing priorities within the school district, besides reaping the benefit of having fewer kids to bus when bus drivers are already in such short supply. Are there plans to widen this radius for schools in particular, or is the focus on ¼ and ½ miles around the school simply because the need for the infrastructure too widespread and needs to start somewhere? I ask in part because Montgomery County has its own SRTS team and a significant amount of SRTS information on their MCDOT website, which means that they are strategically using SRTS as a tool to implement their wider walking and biking safety goals, both in terms of infrastructure and educational programming. I wish that we would better utilize that grant money in a similar way here in Howard County.

Another note on prioritization: Are there specific modality shift goals in this document? If so, I haven’t found them yet. This document, while wonderfully refreshing in many ways, seems to focus on building infrastructure on the main roads without necessarily changing the supporting infrastructure to make other modes of transportation more comfortable or realistic. Below are some examples of possible steps that could happen beyond just road infrastructure if various modal shift goals were adopted:

  Bicycles and electric assist bicycles.
- Pushing for more bike racks at destinations such as schools, grocery stores, or places of worship either by direct placement or perhaps by matching grants that would defray some of the cost at specific destinations.
- In the same way that the building code was recently changed to require a certain number of EV chargers per number of residents; a modal shift toward bicycles could similarly prompt a change in code requiring a certain number of bike racks—even covered bike racks!—per number of residents in new construction.
- Adding paint markings to indicate where bicyclists should stop in order to trigger the induction loop at stop lights, or to standardize the use of bicycle-recognizing cameras to trigger a green light that way.

  Pedestrian priority.
- The cross walks in places like Old Ellicott City would prioritize pedestrian shoppers instead of forcing pedestrians to wait until the cars had finished an entire cycle. This is not a matter of adding infrastructure, but the timing of the lights there reflect the county’s current de facto decision to prioritize cars over every other mode of transportation.

Consider the number of crosswalks per mile so pedestrians could conveniently cross without having to add absurdly long jogs to their path in search of a legal crossing point. If a shift toward traveling by foot were actually the priority, it would result in more stop signs for cars to allow for
more frequent crosswalks. It may also point towards decriminalizing jaywalking if that is currently illegal to do here in Howard County.

- Pedestrian prioritization could also result in a public goal of zero pedestrian deaths per year, seeing pedestrian fatalities as a generally avoidable tragedy.
- Applying for Safe Routes to School money to enact “walking school buses”, Walk and Roll days, “Kiss and Go” parking lots nearby schools, and other programs aimed at convincing families to let their kids walk rather than get driven to school.

Public transit
- Allowing tri-plexes and quad-plexes in places that are currently zoned for single family housing so we have the density necessary to support a public transit system.
- This could also show up as rewriting the zoning rules and renovation requirements so that they are easy enough for someone with a high school education to understand and act on; if no lawyer is required to know how to renovate, then a wider group of people can participate in small scale development and therefore individual homeowners or small-scale developers would be more likely to make changes to their own property.

Beyond adding infrastructure along roads, a formal modality shift goal will go the step further by allowing lawmakers and planners to help change the culture by considering the wider context, existing laws, and new policies that could produce more cohesive vision going forward. Given the cul-de-sac design prevalent in our roads and the long stretches between cross streets, I personally think that shifting to greater bicycling is the more sustainable long-term goal for our county, but that public transit and walking could play a part in targeted applications (like immediately surrounding public schools).

- Section 1.4.C. Typo. In brackets is what I think you meant to add: “All reports shall be submitted on 8-[1]/2 by 11-inch bond paper”

**Q7**

Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 2 - Street Design? Please include section number (e.g., 2.2, 2.3) and/or page number in your response.

- Page 2-2 reads, “Target speed is obtained by providing a roadway typical section and environment that is self-enforcing, that is the roadway features encourage compliance.” I literally gasped out loud with relief to see such a sensible sentence and read it aloud to my husband in admiration. Then I saw Table 2-1, which is saying that they are designing the speed to be 30 mph but setting the speed limit to 25 mph. By the author’s own admission, this will not be self-enforcing. People will speed. So what was the point of the lower speed limit that no one is expected to follow except on their best days? When it comes to fatality rates when cars hit into pedestrians and bicyclists, that 5 mph differential makes an enormous difference in the bicyclists’ and pedestrian’s chance for survival. Please just design the road to be self-enforcing at the speed
limit.

Better yet, review the data from the 1999 NHTSA report from the US Department of Transportation titled “Literature Review on Vehicle Travel Speeds and Pedestrian Injuries” which shows an exponential increase in survivability as vehicle speeds go down. At 20mph only 5% of pedestrians will die and a mere 65% would survive but with an injury. At 30mph, however (not a huge difference in speed to a car) a full 45% will die and another 50% will survive, but with injuries. Rather than designing the road at 30mph, where only 5% will walk away without injury and almost half will die, could we please instead set the design speeds to 20mph, so that instead my kids and I will only have a 5% chance of dying overall?

- Page 2-3, designations for design and control vehicles, WB-62. Typo. Contains an extra space after the n dash.

- General comment: I have never heard of LTS-1 through LTS-4, but I am so grateful that the county is prioritizing LTS-1 around schools where possible.

- Page 2-22: I’m also excited to hear that advisory bike lanes are a possible option “with FHWA approval to experiment.” Not all bike lanes (or even walking infrastructure) may get used, and so being able to prototype and gather data to decide whether certain interventions will warrant a permanent investment is important. How long are these experiments intended to last? A few days? A week? In some places around the world, I have heard of places that do as long as five seasons (a season + a full year of data collection) so that residents have an opportunity to figure out a routine around that route. Is there an optimal time people are expecting experiments to take? What data collection is part of experiments? Would the county be willing to try experiments in projects wider than bike lanes? Will specific funding be put aside for this during the planning process? Can we add a prototyping phase using techniques similar to "tactical urbanism" to find the best design for areas, or at least for certain projects?

- Section 2.6.C—Has a study been done to show that these parking minimums are actually necessary in our area? Many spots go unfilled even on Black Friday and other peak use times at shopping centers, for example. I would much rather let businesses conduct their own research to see how much parking they actually need, or even do a parking *maximum* instead of a minimum (where the maximum is set at the old minimums).

Parking is expensive for developers to put in, but it’s also expensive to the community in lost opportunities. If developers were allowed to thoughtfully choose the amount of off-street parking (and especially if on street parking became metered at the same time), it would force companies to actually consider the tradeoffs of massive parking lots versus more productive spaces. It would also raise the taxes coming in per acre of land because the land would be more productive. On a small-scale example, my family personally only uses one out of two parking spaces assigned to
our townhome. Had we been given a choice, that ~250 sq ft could have allowed for a more spacious townhome than we currently have, or more townhomes overall could have fit in the same land mass had we each been given only one parking spot instead of two. In the latter case, more homes could have been sold on the same plot of land and therefore each of our home prices would have been more affordable. I also frequently eye that empty parking space and wonder if we could legally find a way to use it for a large vegetable garden someday.

The point is that parking may not always be the most productive use of a space, and forcing parking also forces longer distances between destinations, which over times breeds the use of more cars to travel said distances. By requiring a certain number of parking spots, we are still choosing to prioritize car storage over other productive uses of space. The same is true of the assumption that all on-street parking is necessarily going to be free parking. Car storage is still absolutely necessary, but the particular numbers chosen here may not be based on reality and eliminating car minimums (or instituting car maximums) will allow the market to make hard calculations about the best use of that space.

- Page 2-85, design criteria 3a and 3d: It sounds like the roads are being designed here with projected traffic volumes and “acceptable level of service”—or how many more cars designers anticipate will be on the road. If the whole point is that we are making biking, walking, and transit more accessible, isn’t it possible that we will actually have *fewer* cars on the road as more people are able to switch their short trips to walking and biking modalities? If we are always designing for more cars by default, then we are necessarily squeezing out biking and walking by eternally spreading out the distances between desirable destinations and making it harder and harder to cross increasingly wide roads without a car. Using something like the expected number of miles traveled by car (Vehicle Miles Travelled) can allow developers the space to plan for alternative travel like biking and walking, without necessarily assuming every resident must automatically travel 100% of their errands solely by car.

Q8
What is your feedback on Volume III, Chapter 3 - Design of Bridges, Retaining Walls, and Small Structures? Please include section number (e.g., 3.2, 3.3) and/or page number in your response.

No comment.

Q9
Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 4 - Adequate Road Facilities Test Evaluation Requirements? Please include section number (e.g., 4.2, 4.3) and/or page number in your response.
Section 4.3.C.3—Projected traffic growth rate. Since less than 2% of Howard County’s land remains undeveloped in Howard County, the assumption that background traffic growth will grow by a whopping 3% every year seems incredibly high. Further, research shows that increasing the width of roads actually increases traffic that comes to that road. If a particular driver is thinking of going to run an errand but thinks, “Ugh. Snowden River Parkway is really crowded during rush hour” then that driver is not as likely to go unless they really need it. But if the road keeps being extended, then that driver is more likely to think, “You know, it’s an easy shot from here to there; I’ll stop and pick it up anyway.” Snowden River Parkway, as a result, is a road that I bike an extra 3-4 miles to avoid, which is a significant jog for a bicyclist. Research shows that induced demand is a real phenomenon, and assuming that we are going to be growing 3% every year seems like a fast way to get us to wider and wider roads (thus discouraging walking and bicycling) rather than a way to actually reduce traffic.

Q10
Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 5 - Multimodal Traffic Studies? Please include section number (e.g., 5.2, 5.3) and/or page number in your response.

No comment (it's getting late)

Q11
Do you have feedback on Volume IV, typical cross sections and details? Please include detail number (found in the lower right corner) in your response.

Link was not working, so I could not read this document.

Q12
How did you inform yourself about the changes in the Design Manual? (Please check all that apply)

I attended Workshop #1 - Introduction to the HC Complete Streets Design Manual - on October 14 (or watched the recording)

I reviewed the draft Design Manual myself online.
Respondent #6

Q4

What is your interest in the Design Manual? [Please answer the one(s) that align(s) closest to your interest.]

Member of community organization with special interest in transportation

Which elements of the County transportation system are you interested in?

Bicycle facilities, including bike lanes, pathways, etc.

Q6

Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 1 - Introduction and General Information? Please include section number (e.g., 1.2, 1.3) and/or page number in your response.

pg. 1-3/4 Equity priority areas shown are primarily in Columbia neighborhoods that in many cases already have pathways and sidewalks. The equity element should be considered as should existing LOS for project prioritization.

pg. 1-10 Road Types. The descriptions of street types are well written and clear but there is no acknowledgement of where descriptors come from in references. Also there should be a reference to which streets in County have been classified.

Multiple reference to Traffic Studies (in Sections 1 and 2) which are a factor used by Planning and Zoning Boards for rezoning and zoning regulation amendment (ZRA) decisions. It needs to be clearer whether Complete Streets traffic studies which consider the impact of the proposals on existing alternative transportation accessibility and needs for improved facilities is required of developers/proposers to fund present or P&Z transportation engineers.

pg. 1-6 TIPS prioritization should emphasize connectivity between locations/nodes that cyclists/pedestrians would want/be able to travel by bike/foot. These should also include linkages to corridors for recreational cyclists to travel to rural roads.

Q7

Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 2 - Street Design? Please include section number (e.g., 2.2, 2.3) and/or page number in your response.

To be included in (separate) comment letter

Q8

What is your feedback on Volume III, Chapter 3 - Design of Bridges, Retaining Walls, and Small
Structures? Please include section number (e.g., 3.2, 3.3) and/or page number in your response.

To be included in (separate) comment letter

Q9
Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 4 - Adequate Road Facilities Test Evaluation Requirements? Please include section number (e.g., 4.2, 4.3) and/or page number in your response.

pg. 4-3 Traffic Growth Assessment of whether the 3% (down from 6%) vehicular traffic growth rate is still too high considering improvements in alternative transportation options plus new pandemic work from home culture.

pg. 4-5 Consider whether vehicular LOS should be considered for projects or whether Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) might be a more appropriate metric to use to determine road width/lanes.

Q10
Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 5 - Multimodal Traffic Studies? Please include section number (e.g., 5.2, 5.3) and/or page number in your response.

pg. 5-11/12 Tables (also pg. 2-2) Link design speeds and target speeds i.e., streets should be designed/retrofitted to enable vehicular traffic speeds that do not exceed intended/target speeds.

Q11
Do you have feedback on Volume IV, typical cross sections and details? Please include detail number (found in the lower right corner) in your response.

Overall comment on look and feel of Volume IV. It looks too much like a cut and paste document for a near final draft intended to go to Council by end of 2021. It needs significant editing to make it more of a finished product. That includes tables and sections adopted from other documents.

Q12
How did you inform yourself about the changes in the Design Manual? (Please check all that apply)

I attended Workshop #1 - Introduction to the HC Complete Streets Design Manual - on October 14 (or watched the recording)

I attended Workshop #2 - Technical Overview to the HC Complete Streets Design Manual - on October 21 (or watched the recording)

I reviewed the draft Design Manual myself online.
Respondent #7

Q4
What is your interest in the Design Manual? [Please answer the one(s) that align(s) closest to your interest.]
Interested member of the public

Q5
Which elements of the County transportation system are you interested in?
Respondent skipped this question

Q6
Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 1 - Introduction and General Information? Please include section number (e.g., 1.2, 1.3) and/or page number in your response.
Respondent skipped this question

Q7
Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 2 - Street Design? Please include section number (e.g., 2.2, 2.3) and/or page number in your response.

I'm a bicyclist as well as motorist. I always feel like a second-class citizen on a bike. Not only is my life at risk when I ride on the streets but, the signal light sensors are not able to 'see' me, so they do not change, to let me through intersections when there are no cars. I am forced to "break" vehicular laws (which bikes are supposed to adhere to) to get through an intersection. This happens regularly at side streets with 108 and also at 175 and Thunder Hill Rd. At least at Thunder Hill Rd I have the option to go to the pedestrian 'sidewalk' and punch the button to cross; otherwise I have to wait for several cycles of the light skipping me until a car comes along to 'trigger' the signal light.

If the County is truly serious about bicycle vehicle traffic (going green) you need to get serious about all aspects of bicycle use on our streets including:
  >signal sensors for bikes at intersections! (The sensors in the paving are not adequate for alternative vehicles!)
  >the tendency to suddenly remove/leave out the bike lane at unexpected times when it is not convenient for vehicular traffic patterns (including forced merges!)
  >making sure drivers know how to respond to bike accommodations
  >monitoring and recording near misses and accidents between cars and bikes

Q8
What is your feedback on Volume III, Chapter 3 - Design of Bridges, Retaining Walls, and Small
Structures? Please include section number (e.g., 3.2, 3.3) and/or page number in your response.

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q9**

Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 4 - Adequate Road Facilities Test Evaluation Requirements? Please include section number (e.g., 4.2, 4.3) and/or page number in your response.

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q10**

Do you have feedback on Volume III, Chapter 5 - Multimodal Traffic Studies? Please include section number (e.g., 5.2, 5.3) and/or page number in your response.

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q11**

Do you have feedback on Volume IV, typical cross sections and details? Please include detail number (found in the lower right corner) in your response.

**Respondent skipped this question**

**Q12**

How did you inform yourself about the changes in the Design Manual? (Please check all that apply)

**Respondent skipped this question**