

<p>Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council</p> <p>Summary of Meeting</p> <p>February 7, 2011</p>
--

Council Members or designees present (in alphabetical order by last name):

<i>Council Member, Organization</i>	<i>Designee (if applicable)</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Debbie Hunt, FDOT (Chair)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Timothy Ashley, Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grady Carrick
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Karen Brunelle, Federal Highway Administration	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ken Bryan, Rails to Trails Conservancy	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jesus Gomez, Florida Public Transportation Association	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Sue Hann, Florida League of Cities	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Thomas Hawkins, Florida League of Cities	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Charlie Hood, Department of Education	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Joey Hoover, Florida Association of Counties	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard Hopkins, Department of Health	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Laurie Koburger, Department of Elder Affairs	<input type="checkbox"/> Marcus Richartz
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mike Lasche, Florida Bicycle Association	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Zoe Mansfield, Florida League of Cities	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Malisa McCreedy, Pedestrian Representative	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Patricia Northey, Florida Association of Counties	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jo Penrose, Department of Community Affairs	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Max Rothman, Transportation Disadvantaged Representative	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cyndi Stevenson, Florida Association of Counties	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sarah Ward, Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Wood, Department of Environmental Protection	<input type="checkbox"/>

Facilitators:

Hal Beardall and Rafael Montalvo (FCRC Consensus Center)

FDOT Staff:

Kathleen Neill, Huiwei Shen, Rob Magee, David Blodgett, and Paula San Gregorio (FDOT Office of Policy Planning); Dennis Scott, Pat Pieratte, Ralph Saluas, and Providence Nagy (FDOT Safety Office); David O'Hagan and MaryAnne Koos (FDOT Office of Design); Rodney Floyd (FDOT Transportation Statistics Office); Diane Quigley (FDOT Public Transit Office); Fred Noble (FDOT Environmental Manage Office); George Lovett (FDOT District 5)

Observers:

Emily Fritz, Lean McNaughton (Florida Department of Health); Joe Mizereck (3 Feet Please/Safe Cycling, LLC); Heather Murphy (Safe Routes to School Florida Network); Mike Neidhart (Gannett Fleming); Theo Petritsch (Sprinkle Consulting); Harry Reed (Capital Region Transportation Planning Agency); and Henry Stevenson (citizen)

Meeting Highlights

Please refer to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council page on the FDOT website, <http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/policy/bikeped/>, for all meeting materials, including the agenda, presentations, and summary documentation.

Opening Remarks, Introductions, and Agenda Review

The third Florida Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council meeting commenced at 9:00 am at the FDOT Headquarters in the Burns Building Auditorium. Bob Romig, State Transportation Development Administrator, on behalf of Debbie Hunt, FDOT Assistant Secretary for Intermodal Systems Development, welcomed the Council members and thanked them for their participation.

Hal Beardall of the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium (FCRC) Consensus Center provided an overview of the agenda. Mr. Beardall stated each presentation will be followed by an opportunity to ask questions and/or discuss concerns.

Two new Council members were introduced:

- Sara Ward, representing the Statewide MPO Advisory Council; and
- Jim Wood, representing the Office of Greenways and Trails of the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

Review Revised Council Charge and Draft Council Work Plan

Kathy Neill, FDOT's Director of the Office of Policy Planning, provided an overview of the modifications made to the Council's Charge and Work Plan/Schedule based on discussions at Council's October 14th meeting. Chair Debbie Hunt joined the Council meeting during the discussion of the revised Council's Charge and Work Plan/Schedule.

Following the overview, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification.

Member Questions and Comments:

There were no questions and/or comments raised during the discussion of the revised Council's Charge or Work Plan/Schedule.

Brief Updates on Strategic Highway Safety Plan and 2060 Florida Transportation Plan

Strategic Highway Safety Plan

Dennis Scott, FDOT Safety Office, gave a brief presentation on the status of the State's Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP).

Following the presentation, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification. Note: responses from staff are indicated in *italics*.

Member Questions and Comments:

What is the time-frame for the State's Strategic Highway Safety Plan?

The Strategic Highway Safety Plan has a 5-year time-frame.

Does the State's Strategic Highway Safety Plan include design standards?

Yes, the Strategic Highway Safety Plan includes design strategies to improve the safety for vulnerable users.

Does the State's Strategic Highway Safety Plan focus on more than individual behavior?

Yes, the Strategic Highway Safety Plan does focus on more than individual behavior; it considers improvements to the transportation system, not just behavioral impacts.

2060 Florida Transportation Plan

Huiwei Shen, FDOT Office of Policy Planning, gave a brief presentation on the newly adopted 2060 Florida Transportation Plan (FTP).

Following the presentation, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification. Note: responses from staff are indicated in *italics*.

Member Questions and Comments:

Has the new 2060 FTP been approved by FDOT?

Yes, the Plan has been approved by FDOT. In addition, when the new Secretary is selected by the Governor, FDOT staff will brief the Secretary on the contents of the revised FTP.

Council Chair Debbie Hunt asked members to think how their constituents could best be engaged to develop performance measures as part of the 2060 FTP implementation process.

Suggestions from Council members related to Performance Measures included:

- Develop both quantitative and qualitative measures that can account for quality of life issues.

- Need Performance Measures that apply not only to the State as a whole, but to each of the FDOT districts as well
 - *George Lovett stated District 5 has been using measures to judge progress; e.g., training needs, counts at crosswalks, number of counties with bicycle and pedestrian plans. Areas that we are looking to make additional progress in are: non-motorized and motorized education, encouragement of the development of bicycle/pedestrian plans in all 9 counties, inventory of state roads that include both bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and development of strategies promoting bicycle/pedestrian access for commuting by transit.*
- Develop performance measures that emphasize and create linkages between multiple modes.

Presentation and Discussion of Specific Program Funding

Kathy Neill and Dennis Scott gave presentations on bicycle and pedestrian funding programs for: highways, transit, enhancements, congestion mitigation and air quality (CMAQ), recreational trails, and safety.

Following the presentation, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification. Note: responses from staff are indicated in *italics*.

Member Questions and Comments:

Program Funding

What are the funding assumptions based on?

Funding assumptions are based on program levels in current law and budget levels. The Department does not attempt to predict what future changes in federal or state transportation legislation may provide, either in program types or funding levels.

The suggestion was made to have the Department prepare estimates of bicycle and pedestrian funding taking into account recent federal and state discussions related to future program and funding levels. Therefore, develop “what if” scenarios to provide a range of funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Safe Routes to School

A Council member asked if Congressman Mica has given an indication of what he thinks about the Safe Routes to School program if and when SAFETEA-LU is reauthorized. Another Council member responded that Chairman Mica is favorably impressed with the program, although it was also mentioned that Enhancement funding may be in jeopardy when SAFETEA-LU is reauthorized.

What is the role of the Safe Routes to School “concept papers?”

The “concept papers” are used to help assess Safe Routes to School project funding applications.

The Safe Routes to School project application process is cumbersome. Has there been any discussion on streamlining the application process?

The Safe Routes to School application process has been developed to ensure both the schools and the communities collectively value their submitted projects. The application process is meant to ensure the best projects are selected for funding.

The Council then discussed the Safe Routes to School application process and the need to streamline the process to help schools and communities.

Highway Safety Improvement Program

Can Highway Safety Improvement Program funds be used on any road?

Highway Safety Improvement Program funds can be used on any public road.

Where do the 402 safety funds fit into all of this?

Highway Safety Funds are used to support State and community programs to reduce deaths and injuries on highways. Section 402(b) in SAFETEA-LU sets forth the minimum requirements for a State's highway safety program. The 402(b) funds are one category of funds the FDOT uses to fund safety initiatives.

Does the project ranking process describe the trade-offs between the Department's stated goals?

The FDOT looks at a multitude of purposes for meeting its goals for transportation projects, such as safety, mobility, economic competitiveness, and number of jobs produced. Each project is unique, and therefore is assessed on its merits within the context of the broader community with which the project is a part of.

Based on the current economic climate, future transportation funding levels will likely be reduced. Preserving funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects needs to be a priority. It was pointed out research has shown bicycle and pedestrian projects are more cost effective than traditional roadway projects.

Please send us a copy of the referenced research on the economic benefits of bicycle and pedestrian projects so we may pass it along to each Council member.

Much of the discussion has focused on program funding. A suggestion was made the Council should focus on what our priorities should be irrespective of funding categories, which will invariably change as part of the next reauthorization. Priorities should be based on needs rather than program funding categories.

Presentation and Discussion of Benefits from Investment in Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities

Dennis Scott gave a presentation on the benefits of investment in bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and then Theo Petritsch of Sprinkle Consulting gave a presentation on the Conserve by Bicycling and Walking study.

Following the presentations, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification. Note: responses from staff are indicated in *italics*.

Member Questions and Comments:

The East Central Florida Regional Planning Council (ECFRPC) is working with the Florida Office of Greenways and Trails, Orange County, the City of Winter Garden, the U.S. Forest Service, and the Florida Greenways and Trails Foundation to assess the economic impact of trails in Orange County and Winter Garden. The study's preliminary results should be released soon, while the full report should be ready in a couple of months.

Has Florida done a cost-benefit analysis on bicycle and pedestrian projects?

There have been studies in Florida on the benefits of non-motorized travel, such as the recent Conserve by Bicycling and Walking effort. In addition, a Pinellas County study illustrated approximately two-thirds of trips on the Pinellas Trail are for utilitarian purposes.

Recreational bicycling tends to increase utilitarian bicycling.

Bicycling and walking are driven by land use planning. Comprehensive plans create land use patterns that can support walking and bicycling use. We can build all the sidewalks we want, but without the proper land use patterns the effectiveness of these facilities will be diminished.

From a land use perspective, you get the biggest use through increasing density. The trend in the market appears to be supportive of alternative means of travel, such as bicycling and walking.

When was the Conserve by Bicycling and Walking study done?

Work on the Conserve by Bicycling and Walking study was performed between 2006 and 2008.

Is there an Executive Summary of the Conserve by Bicycling and Walking study?

Yes, the FDOT Safety website includes the entire study, which includes an Executive Summary.

The Council then discussed the development of conceptual models that can relate investment in bicycle/pedestrian facilities to specific benefits. The discussion also emphasized investments that complete or create key linkages between components of the overall transportation system in order to get the most benefit from investment dollars.

Presentation – Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities on the State Highway System

Rob Magee, Senior Policy Analyst in the Office of Policy Planning and project manager for the Council, provided an overview of the availability and coverage of Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities on the State Highway System.

Following the presentation, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification. Note: responses from staff are indicated in *italics*.

Member Questions and Comments:

Is there a way to visualize the connectivity of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the State Highway System?

We will prepare a map that visualizes the connectivity of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the State Highway System.

Can you show the urban and rural boundaries in relation to the connectivity of bike lanes and sidewalks?

Yes, we will prepare bike lane and sidewalk maps of several urban areas throughout the State to illustrate the connectivity of facilities in urban and rural areas.

The presentation combined bike lane and sidewalk mileage together. Can this mileage be presented independent/separately from each other?

Yes, we will provide the mileage for bike lanes and sidewalks separately.

District 5 staff discussed the mapping work they have undertaken and how it has helped identify “gaps” within the District. This analysis has helped to identify good projects. Can you explain what a “good” project is?

A good project is one that not only is identified in a gap-analysis, but is also a priority in a MPO/TPO/local government bicycle/pedestrian master plan.

The next step could be an exploration of each district developing its own gap analysis.

Building new bicycle and pedestrian facilities are important, but maintaining our existing infrastructure is also important. What is FDOT’s plan regarding maintenance?

The efficient operation and management of all transportation facilities will ensure travel remains safe and reliable. Key objectives include: maintaining a state of good repair for transportation assets for all modes; reducing the vulnerability and increasing the resilience of critical infrastructure to the impacts of climate trends and events; minimizing damage to infrastructure from transportation vehicles; and optimizing the efficiency of the transportation system for all modes.

Review and Discuss Safety and System Data

Mary Anne Koos, Special Projects Coordinator for FDOT's Design Office, provided a presentation on safety and system data as well as an update on a research study that examined the interaction between vehicles and bicyclists utilizing existing pavement.

Following the presentation, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification. Note: responses from staff are indicated in *italics*.

Member Questions and Comments:

FDOT staff provided clarification on a few of the presentation slides.

In regards to the research study on lane width and bicycling, did FDOT look at lane widths for trucks?

The overall goal of the research is to examine how best to utilize existing pavement widths. We did notice that truck drivers tended to be conscientious about slowing down and waited to pass cyclists until they could move over. Trucks and cyclists both benefit from having more space in the outside through lane.

From the data, are you able to tell whether a crash occurred as a result of bicycle/pedestrian error or as the result of an automobile driver error?

One would have to look at the individual crash reports to make a reliable assessment of the contributing causes and then possibly fault. A statewide study of fatal crashes was undertaken approximately 10 years ago.

Are beaches designated as a state road since vehicles are allowed to drive on them?

No.

If a crash occurs on the beach, does it show-up in the crash statistics?

Not necessarily. A large percentage of bicycle and pedestrian related crashes are never reported, or are reported on a short-form report, which would be included in the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles' (DHSMV's) records but not FDOT's crash data base.

The facilitators asked the Council members to think about how they and the agencies they represent as partners make the best use of data and how they share data with others.

Review and Discuss Key Pedestrian/Bicycle Facility Design Issues

David O'Hagan, FDOT's State Roadway Design Engineer, provided a presentation on three bicycle and pedestrian design topics: Plans Preparation Manual & Florida Greenbook, Design Exceptions & Variations, and Pilot Projects.

Following the presentation, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification. Note: responses from staff are indicated in *italics*.

Member Questions and Comments:

Plans Preparation Manual & Florida Greenbook

Can you clarify what the difference is between the Plans Preparation Manual and the Florida Greenbook, and when each should be used?

The Plans Preparation Manual includes design standards and criteria for roads on the State Highway System, while the Florida Greenbook includes minimum design standards for county roads and local city streets.

Design Exceptions & Variations

Is pavement smoothness a design criterion?

Yes, pavement smoothness and other controlling surface elements are design considerations; although items such as raised pavement reflectors are not considered a design exception.

Are design variations reviewed by the District Engineer?

Yes, each District Design Engineer is responsible for reviewing and approving (or disapproving) design variations since they are more familiar with the local area.

Is there a State law that prohibits bicyclists and pedestrians on limited access facilities?

Yes, State law currently prohibits bicyclists and pedestrians on limited access facilities. The Department is working with the Florida Bicycle Association on drafting legislative language authorizing bicyclists and pedestrians on limited access facilities for three pilot projects.

Is there a federal law that prohibits bicyclists and pedestrians on limited access facilities?

No, Florida law currently prohibits bicyclists and pedestrians on limited access facilities. Other states do allow bicyclists and pedestrians on limited access facilities.

The Suncoast Parkway has a dedicated bicycling/walking trail, why can't other limited access facilities in Florida be designed in a similar manner?

The Suncoast Parkway was designed and built by the Florida Turnpike Enterprise with a shared use path separated by a fence from the roadway – all crossings are grade separated. As a result, bicyclists and pedestrian do not have access to the road itself.

Is there a design exception process for limited access bridges?

No, there is not a design exception process to allow bicyclists and pedestrians on limited access bridges.

What are the impacts of rumble stripes on bicyclists?

Rumble stripes are rumble strips painted with a reflective coating to increase the visibility of the pavement edge at night and during inclement weather conditions. Rumble stripes can be designed to be bicycle friendly. FDOT is testing a modified version of an in-ground rumble stripe underneath the outside lane edge line to determine ridability for cyclists.

What is the U.S. Bicycle Route System and how do you apply for a route to be designated?

The U.S. Bicycle Route System is a route numbering system developed by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and is similar to the route numbering system that was developed for the Interstate system. The application process for designation is submitted by the State and is approved by AASHTO.

Will scenic highways be part of the U.S. Bicycle Route System?

Scenic highways could be included in the U.S. Bicycle Route System. The location of US Bicycle Routes in Florida has not yet been determined.

Discussion ensued regarding the exploration of opportunities to co-locate Scenic Highways and U.S. Bicycle Routes.

MPO Processes for Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning

Rob Magee provided an overview of a survey sent to all MPOs/TPOs in Florida regarding their involvement in bicycle and pedestrian planning.

Following the presentation, members were asked if there were any items needing additional clarification. Note: responses from staff are indicated in *italics*.

Member Questions and Comments:

Can we get a copy of the raw data?

Yes, we will provide a copy of the survey data to the Council.

Though many of the MPOs/TPOs have bicycle and pedestrian master plans, it was noted many of these plans have not been updated or do not include a list of prioritized needed projects.

Do the Districts have a list of "good quality" projects to choose from?

Not all MPOs/TPOs provide bicycle and pedestrian priority lists based on an up-to-date master plan. A key obstacle for many local governments is acquiring the necessary right-of-way for their projects.

Discussion on coordination/communication between neighboring local governments was raised, along with how budget concerns are affecting local government Public Works departments.

A discussion on MPO/TPO governance ensued, which raised the question - are MPOs/TPOs structured and/or staffed similarly throughout Florida?

The Center for Urban Transportation Research (CUTR) at the University of South Florida recently conducted a study related to MPO/TPO structure and staffing. A copy of this report will be provided to Council members.

Are there design limitations on scenic corridors?

A key limitation on scenic corridors is the prohibition of outdoor advertising.

Does FDOT have other corridor programs similar to scenic corridors? A point was made that the scenic corridor program could be used as a template to develop a bicycle and pedestrian corridor program.

Staff was unaware of any other corridor protection programs that are similar to the scenic corridor program. However, staff would research this issue for the Council. It was noted that local governments have created their own independent programs, e.g., Winter Park, where the city developed regulations for governments/FDOT to follow for how a corridor should look and function.

Public Comment

No public comment at this time

Review and Discuss Member Identified Best Practices from Other States ("Homework Assignment")

Debbie Hunt thanked those Council members that provided materials in advance as part of the "Homework Assignment." Council members identified the following best practices:

Safety

- Community Traffic Safety Teams (CTSTs)
- National Walking School Bus program

- Child safety when walking to school (e.g., parents perception versus reality, traffic volumes, land use decisions on school siting—locating schools along or near arterial roads, larger property requirement for school siting, elimination of neighborhood schools, etc.)
- State Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Plan
 - *FDOT is planning to undertake a statewide Pedestrian Safety Action Plan*
- Pedestrian Safety Action Plan evaluations for communities

Collaboration

- Need to create effective partnerships, especially with agencies that have overlapping responsibilities – increase coordination

Community Programs (Outside of Florida)

- Comprehensive bicycle map, reduced fines, increased enforcement (Davis, CA)
- Creation of bicycle friendly community: 1-mile of new bike trails every year since 1989, 48% of funding spent on bicycle/pedestrian trails, 95% of streets have bike lanes (Boulder, CO)
- Bicycle registration requirements: \$10 every 4 years, required by law, bicycle shops register bikes at time of purchase (Madison, WI)
- Bike libraries where you rent/share bikes locally

Economic Impact

- Identify latent demand for bicycling and walking
- Identify economic impact of tourists that ride bicycles and/or walk

Recreation and Functional Use

- Integration of recreation and utilitarian bicycle/pedestrian trips
- Coordination between different state agencies to develop a master plan

Law Enforcement

- Develop training for law enforcement officers
- Computer based training pilot program on pedestrian safety

Other

- Roundabouts
 - *FDOT working on roundabout design chapter to address bicycle/pedestrian safety*
- Encourage school districts to adopt system-wide child traffic safety education in their physical education curricula
- Context sensitive solutions in roadway design
 - *FDOT has a chapter on context sensitive design in the project management handbook*
- Complete Streets
 - *Jurisdictions in Florida are putting this concept into their local development regulations/plans*
- Prohibition of the operation of motorized vehicles on sidewalks

Discuss Next Steps and Assignments

The facilitators asked Council members to consider how they might use the information discussed during the meeting to formulate or support recommendations to be developed at future meetings.

Debbie Hunt asked Council members if there were any other issues we have not already identified that need to be considered for future meetings.

A topic that was identified was the connection between bicyclists/pedestrians and transit.

The next meeting will likely be scheduled after the end of the 2011 legislative session.

Debbie Hunt reminded the Council members to sign-up for the FDOT TranPlan e-News post. A link will be sent to each Council member.

Meeting Evaluation Survey

Debbie Hunt asked members to fill out the meeting evaluation form (see results in Appendix A).

Adjourn

Debbie Hunt thanked members for their participation. Hearing no additional comments or issues to be discussed, the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.

APPENDIX A: Meeting Evaluation Summary
Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council
3rd Council Meeting
 Tallahassee, Florida

February 7, 2011 – 9:00 am to 4:00 pm

	☺		☹		⊗		
	<u>Agree</u>				<u>Disagree</u>		
	<i>CIRCLE ONE</i>						
	5	4	3	2	1		Summary
<u>WERE THE MEETING OBJECTIVES MET?</u>							
To review the revised Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council Charge and Work Plan Schedule	10	2	0	0	0		4.83
To review presentations on and discuss: specific program funding; benefits from investment in bike/ped facilities; pedestrian and bicycle facilities on the State Highway System; safety and system data; member identified pedestrian and bicycle design issues; and, MPO, County and City processes for making bicycle and pedestrian improvements	8	4	0	0	0		4.67
To receive informational briefings on design standards for pedestrian and bicycle facilities and transportation funding	8	3	0	0	0		4.72
To agree on next steps, assignments, and the preparation for the 4 th Council Meeting to be held in Spring 2011	6	2	2	0	0		4.40
MEETING ORGANIZATION							
Background and agenda packet were helpful	8	4	0	0	0		4.67
Presentations were effective and informative	9	3	0	0	0		4.75
Plenary discussion format was effective	9	3	0	0	0		4.75
Facilitator guided participant efforts effectively	8	4	0	0	0		4.67
Participation was balanced	7	3	1	1	0		4.33

What Did You Like Best About the Meeting?

- Learning about funding programs and how they work
- Free, open discussion
- Presentation on MPOs and Bike-Ped data – information sharing
- Discussions
- The chance for a good discussion – comments from others

- Thanks for keeping us focused on the task – making our time effective

What Could Be Improved?

- Limit commenter times – we all need to get to the point
- Room temperature was a bit cool
- I need to better understand what our planning assignment is
- Nothing – thanks!

Other Comments (use the back if necessary)

- None offered