

Date: September 20, 2011

To: Charlie Strunk

From: Dan Goodman and Bob Patten, TDG
David Jackson and Stacy Cook, CS

RE: Meeting Notes – BAC Meeting #2
Countywide Bicycle Master Plan
August 31, 2011



Meeting Attendees

Consultant Team: Dan Goodman, Bob Patten, David Jackson, Stacy Cook

The area with a gray background was added as a post meeting note to clarify the issue discussed at the meeting and describe how the team will organize the online map tool to address it.

Discussion Points

The project team provided an overview of recent work, data compilation and preliminary analysis, and the bike facility toolbox. A detailed review of the schedule and approach for public outreach was provided. In addition, there was a discussion of various potential approaches for the development of goals, objectives, performance measures, and implementation steps.

General Meeting Comments

- Question: Will the PowerPoint be provided after the meeting? Answer: Yes.
- Question: What is the expectation for the project website's role after the plan is completed? Answer: The project team can turn the website over to FCDOT for maintenance when the Toole Design/Cambridge Systematics role is complete.
- It was noted that a link to the bike map is provided on the website.

Online Mapping Tool

- It was noted that a link to the online mapping tool will be provided. It was requested that the link to the tool remain limited to BAC members only, as it is not a password protected site.
- The road naming and label functionality of the online tool was discussed.
- It was noted that the most important thing to do is make sure that the base layers, for example existing bike lanes, is correct or not. The online mapping tool will be used at the outset to get feedback on the existing facilities data.
- Question: Regarding the BLOS analysis, if a road is not depicted in the layer, is it assumed to be a neighborhood street? Answer: In the online mapping tool, two separate layers will be provided that address "existing quality of bicycling conditions": a) the Bicycle Level of Service rating and b) the Fairfax Bike Map rating. The Consultant team will adjust the tool to make that clear. The BLOS layer will show all the roads studied for BLOS in 2007 in one of six colors. Each color represents the final score: A, B, C, D, E, F. The Fairfax Bike Map layer will show Preferred and Less Preferred routes exactly as they are on the printed paper maps. By toggling between these

Countywide Bicycle Master Plan

two layers, or putting them both on, you will be able to identify roadways that were studied for BLOS, but not highlighted on the Bike Map. There are a variety of reasons for this, i.e. they scored D, E or F; there are alternatives that are better; there are other safety factors or terrain issues that suggested they not be shown on the Bike Map at all. If a road has no BLOS rating, it may have been left out of the study for various reasons, i.e. it's a low-volume neighborhood street, there was a limit on the number of miles that could be studied, it was a road that was designed like an interstate and is virtually unrideable, bikes are not allowed by law, etc.

- Fairfax County revitalization areas should be added to the online mapping tool.
- It was suggested that COG's activity/employment centers should be considered, but it was noted that the purpose of the tool is to review and comment on the proposed network, not as a comprehensive data analysis tool.
- For the online mapping tool there is a need to make sure that all labels and categories are self explanatory. For example, new and update should read something like "Recommend New Facility" and "Update an Existing Recommendation." We may want to consider adding one to focus on "Recommend Updating Existing Facility Data".

BAC Meetings/Geographic Meeting Logic/Schedule

- For October and November meetings it was noted that there may be an overlap with a planned WABA bike summit, also a FABB Board meeting.
- It was noted that the team will email the full meeting schedule to the entire BAC list.
- A purpose of the geographic pre-meeting is to ensure that the public meeting is scheduled at the right time and avoids potential conflicts where possible. The updated schedule will also be provided on the website.
- There is a desire for more opportunities for feedback at the geographic meetings. It was noted that a primary purpose of the pre-meeting is to discuss meeting format and that the team is flexible on format based on local desire.
- Weather is an issue with the planned meetings, especially in January and February. It was noted that a back up date should be established prior to the meeting.

Thematic Group Meetings

- Regarding thematic groups, it was suggested that bike education for adults, motorists, pedestrians, etc. should be considered. This could meeting could include engagement of League of American Bicyclists, as well as School officials, leaders of adult education programs and others. The SRTS grouping should be broadened to include bicycling and young people and should include all schools (colleges, universities, etc.). Adding recreation as a theme should be considered. There was a suggestion to group all of the cultural groups together into one "Multicultural" meeting. It was noted that the BAC will need to provide specific guidance in formulating this broader group. There was a suggestion to add public health and education and safety together.
- Question: What is the format of the thematic meetings? Answer: They are envisioned as facilitated discussions with only enough presentation to ensure that all participants are aware of the plan and other base information.

Countywide Bicycle Master Plan

- There was a question about the extent to which the “soft” education and enforcement programs are being included in the process. It was noted the discussion of the “soft” E’s: Education, Encouragement and Enforcement, should be a part of all of the thematic meetings as these meetings are meant to bring together various constituencies that best suited to offer bike-related programs.
- It was noted that the vote sheet should be provide by email to those who could not attend and the responses would be added in. This was done, but no additional ballots were received.

Thematic Focus Groups Voting Results (A total of 10 ballots were collected.)

Participants were asked to pick six themes or constituencies.

Theme/Constituency	Votes
Bicycling and Safe Routes to School	9
Bicycling and Law Enforcement	8
Bicycling and Public Health	7
The Bicycling Industry in Fairfax	7
Bicycle Safety education (write-in response)	6
Bicycling and Contributions from Developers	6
Bicycling and Economic Activity	4
Constituency Based Meeting:	
Multicultural (write-in response)	6
Colleges (write-in response)	4
Special Communities: Youth	4
Special Communities: Latino	3
Special Communities: Seniors	3
Churches (write-in response)	1
Special Communities: Vietnamese	0
Special Communities: Korean	0

Plan Goals and Objectives

- It was noted that the Town of Vienna recently did a survey with information on biking and specifically asking questions of people that do not bike. It was suggested that if getting non bikers to bike is a major goal we should try to engage them in the planning process. It was noted that many of the participants at the thematic meetings will be non-bikers. A survey was suggested to target non-bikers. Previous studies that have examined this issue will be reviewed to see if they provide enough data, or if an additional Fairfax specific effort should be considered.

Countywide Bicycle Master Plan

- There was some discussion about trying to advance bicycling by getting references to it into public plans and policy documents that guide other aspects of public life. There is a need for goals and objectives in Fairfax County set for public health, education, recreation, tourism, economic development, etc. address bicycling at the appropriate level and most effective point of nexus.
- The group discussed different approaches the BAC could take in formulating its own goals versus using existing goals. An important goal is to get non-bikers to bike. Education and encouragement are important. An outcome should be to connect existing goals that have been established but to which the bicycling connection hasn't yet been made. The group discussed various approaches including (1) affirming existing goals, (2) making connection to other County level goals and (3) establishing new goals. It was noted that the team will work to compile and assess the universe of existing goals and distribute a summary document. If desirable, this will be followed by a conference call for interested BAC members to discuss. There was general agreement that the plan should include a traditional goals framework that includes goals, objectives, performance measures, and implementation strategies. Quality of life measures were noted as important goals.
- Performance measures that were discussed included the following: a reduction in crashes, increases in the amount of facilities, and the levels of coordination achieved. It was noted that the coordination related performance measures were especially significant given the extent to which the County relies on VDOT and developers to implement its plans. Increasing the numbers of bikers and the bike mode share were noted.
- It was noted that there may be established pedestrian performance measures that should be investigated.
- There is a need and desire for a mission statement, one that was suggested, and that the group liked, was "Mainstream/incorporate bicycling in everyday life".
- There was a desire to outreach specifically to non-bikers. A short survey was discussed, as noted above. This would focus on why people do not bike and what encouragement programs and incentives they would be most likely to respond to.

Overall Plan Comments

- The Town of Vienna should be shown on the planning area maps. Answer: Future maps will show all towns within the County.
- Additional data identified included:
 - Data from a County transit study
 - Data from the Great Parks, Great Communities planning process
- A typical condition in Fairfax County, for example along Sleepy Hollow Road in Mason District, is for cars to pass left turning vehicles on the right hand side. This could have implications for bike lanes and cyclists on the right side of the road. It was noted that the team will need/want to identify the places where this is a major concern. In general, high-volume, cut-through, secondary roads need safety attention.
- Question: Will the facilities in the NACTO Guide be considered with the toolbox? Answer: Yes.
- Bus and bike interactions should be considered, especially at bus stops.

Countywide Bicycle Master Plan

- Bike parking destinations should be considered. It was noted that bike parking locations are a good discussion topic at the geographic meeting level. There was a suggestion to think about bike parking similar to the way that trailheads are discussed. It was also noted that bike parking is best dealt with at a policy level.
- The Town of Vienna has recently considered/passed code revisions regarding bike corrals in parking lots.
- There was discussion regarding the question of what is a valid transportation trail. The County has a GIS trails layer that includes the full scope of the county trail system (paved, unpaved, hiking, mountain biking, equestrian, etc.). This plan will focus on identifying trail that can and should be part of a Transportation Trails network, because they have value for bicycle transportation. This plan will consider the importance of providing access to all types of trails, but will not necessarily recommend improving or paving all trails. Share use, trail surface, and trail purpose is an issue that the Fairfax Parks Authority and NVRPA address in their planning processes. In situations where a trail exists as a result of new development, and there are significant gaps, it is possible the plan could recommend gap closures that would create a continuous trail facility that could be used for transportation purposes.