

Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council
Summary of Meeting
June 28, 2010

Council Members or designees present (in alpha 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 type="checkbox"/> Timothy Ashley, Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grady Carrick
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jenna Brooks, Department of Environmental Protection	<input type="checkbox"/>
<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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Laurie Koburger, Department of Elder Affairs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marcus Richartz
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mike Lasche, Florida Bicycle Association	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bob Rackleff, Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Max Rothman, Transportation Disadvantaged Representative	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cyndi Stevenson, Florida Association of Counties	<input type="checkbox"/>

Facilitator:

Hal Beardall (FCRC Consensus Center)

FDOT Staff:

Robert Magee, David Blodgett, David Lee, Kathleen Neill, Huiwei Shen, Brian Watts, Monica Zhong (Policy Planning)

Marjorie Bixby, Catherine Bradley (Environmental Management)

Bruce Conroy (Legal)

Ed Hutchinson, Dusty Powell (Systems Planning)

Mary Ann Koos, David O'Hagan (Design)

George Lovett (District 5)

Pat Prieatte, Joe Santos, Dennis Scott (Safety)

Diane Quigley (Transit)

Brad Thoburn (Intermodal Systems Development Administrator)

Fred Wise (Rail)

Peter Haliburton, Colleen McGovern (Cambridge Systematics)

Observers:

Lynn Barr (Capital Region Transportation Planning Agency), Mark Brown (Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles, Florida Highway Patrol), Carolyn Morgan (Northeast Florida Transportation Planning Organization/Clay County Planning and Zoning), Debra Preble (Genesis Group), Marlee Sanderson (Gainesville Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization), Henry Stevenson (citizen), Jim Wood (Department of Environmental Protection, Office of Greenways and Trails)

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, presentation, and summary documentation.

Welcome and Introduction

The first Florida Bicycle Pedestrian Partnership Council meeting and workshop commenced at 11:00 am at FDOT Central Office Burns Building Auditorium. Secretary Kopelousos introduced the Council chair, Debbie Hunt, Assistant Secretary for Intermodal Systems Development, and thanked the members for their participation.

Debbie Hunt welcomed the Council members and stressed the need to work together to make Florida more bicycle and pedestrian friendly.

Hal Beardall of Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium (FCRC) Consensus Center provided an overview of the agenda. The members of the Council were then asked to introduce themselves, identify the perspective they represent, and offer a brief statement of what outcomes they would like to see for the Council. The following summarizes the group's expectations of the outcomes:

- Improved appreciation for what our pedestrian infrastructure should be
- Strengthen partnerships to make communities more walkable
- Support department in developing policies to promote pedestrian and bicycle facilities
- Recognize and acknowledge the need for evolving legislation for bicycles and pedestrians.
- Provided better connections between bicycle and pedestrian facilities and transit
- Better integration of public health issues in planning - develop communities where people feel safe biking and walking everywhere
- Partnership between state and local governments to provide safe access
- Use trail investments to promote economy and mobility
- Provide sidewalks throughout entire communities and promote their use
- Promote coordination to make the state a better place for bicycle and pedestrians
- Link community development and redevelopment with bicycle and pedestrian mobility and connectivity
- Ensure land use is integrated with transportation planning and decision making
- Innovation to increase safe use of bicycle and pedestrian transportation through education and enforcement
- Integrate with high speed rail
- Learn how to get information out to older people, ensure safe mobility options
- More collaboration of planning efforts between agencies and departments (statewide trail planning)
- Reflect communities' roles in bike/pedestrian facilities to ensure incremental development contributes to long term bicycle and pedestrian networks
- Law enforcement's role (behavior of users and enforcement)
- Access to learning for students (safe routes for pedestrians and bicycles).

Government in the Sunshine - Provisions and the Council's Process

Bruce Conroy, Chief of the Administrative Law Division for the FDOT Office of General Council, provided the Council with an overview of the Sunshine Law. The sunshine law requires the Council to provide proper public notice of meetings, keep minutes of the meetings, and restricts members from discussing Council business outside of the public meetings.

Presentation - Roles/Responsibilities Relating to Transportation Decision

Kathy Neill gave an overview of the state transportation system; the transportation decision making process at the federal, state, MPO and local levels; and the agencies and jurisdictions in the state. 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 an FDOT Enterprise?

This includes the Turnpike Enterprise and the newly established Rail Enterprise.

Can you give an overview of where the money comes from and who controls the money?

There are federal and state funds flow through the work program and investments are based on the priorities of metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) and counties in non-MPO areas. We can provide more background information on funding sources and decisionmaking at a future Council meeting.

Review Initial Charge: Bike Pedestrian Partnership Council

Kathy Neill provided an overview of the initial draft charge for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council. A group discussion was facilitated to develop a formal understanding of the role of the group. Members were asked to first comment on the first two paragraphs and then on each bulleted topic.

Member Questions and Comments:

Does our participation preclude us from making legislation regulations? Can the Council make regulations changes?

Will have to see what the recommendations are to determine the best way to handle. The Council may make recommendations or work through partner agencies.

There are now battery assisted bikes that make bicycle travel. Do we need to distinguish between motorized and non-motorized travel?

What partner agencies are we including - are they state and local level?

There are representatives from federal, state, county, and city agencies.

Is the Council advising the department and its partners or just FDOT? The first two paragraphs of the draft charge have contradictory statements.

The Council is advising the department and its partner agencies.

How long is the Council intended to meet?

It has not been determined

Once we make recommendations, how do those get records so that they don't just disappear?

The minutes of Council meetings will be published and Council will produce a report with their recommendations.

The document should have a time frame for deliverables or action items (e.g., progress after one year).

The policies and documents referenced are just FDOT; we also need to look at the documents and policies of other partners. We need to integrate regional planning council plans.

Recommendations to cities and counties can cause concern and push-back. Collaboration with cities and counties will be critical to making Council recommendations.

It would be good for everyone to know who is involved in the 2060 FTP development.

We need to make sure we include persons with disabilities and consider Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance issues.

Design, planning, and safety programs and funding are building blocks for livable communities. Are we going to prioritize these?

The approach is to get all of the issues on the table, then identify priority areas for addressing and making progress.

Design

We need to consider interactions between various travel modes (e.g., bikes, trains).

We should consider best practices in design (e.g., complete streets).

We should be more specific in guidelines and specify the Plans Preparation Manual and the department's design standards.

We should include the interaction between land use planning and transportation planning in the scope. We need to provide connectivity (e.g., we don't want a network of cul-de-sacs that do not connect). We should add comprehensive plans.

We can have a presentation on the comprehensive planning process at a future meeting.

The policies and procedures for comprehensive plan development, 9J-5 of the Florida Administrative Code were recently updated to include recommendations for reducing green house gases and promoting multi modal mobility.

It would be good to have FDOT policies and procedures for pedestrian and bicycle facilities for next meeting to get a better idea of what governs design today.

In the future we are going to have more rail systems (e.g., high speed rail, light rail). We need to plan how pedestrians are going to interact with rail. We also need to consider the interface between modes (e.g., park and ride lots) and plan for a safe exchange between modes.

Best practices for bike and pedestrian planning should rely on the long range transportation plans from metropolitan planning organizations and local jurisdiction comprehensive plans.

We may want to be able to comment to Department of Community Affairs, but not necessarily on local plans.

FDOT policy on corridor management is not conducive to pedestrians (e.g., highest number of vehicles at the highest speed, few signals). Most of fatalities occur on high speed arterial facilities.

Planning

Provide an outline or framework of the planning process.

We don't consider location of public facilities (e.g., schools, public office buildings) in our plans. Schools are often built where land is cheapest and can only be accessed by car or bus.

We need to think about how to get this information out to the public.

We need to segment the market, look at demographics, and operate like a business to deliver the appropriate products.

The U.S. bike route system should be considered.

We need a good inventory of pedestrian and bicycle facilities; we need to look at connectivity.

It would be good to be able to make recommendations to rail and transit offices.

Safety

We cannot just look at roadway design; we need to consider human behavior and vehicle design.

Funds available for transportation problems need to be less siloed and more available for smart solutions.

Programs and Funding

We need to consider fair share for bike/pedestrian improvements. It would be good to have an overview of funding options for bicycle and pedestrian improvements and look at how Sec. 402 and Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds are being used.

We should consider reframing or expanding the last bullet. Instead of compliance, it should focus on encouraging the development more livable communities.

Staff will come back with a recommendation.

We need an honest accounting of where the funding goes for bike and pedestrian infrastructure improvements.

Large parking lots are a disincentive for bicycle/pedestrian modes.

We should make recommendations to bike/pedestrian programs and the rail and transit offices.

Presentation – Safety Trends/Strategic Highway Safety Plan

Dennis Scott, the State Pedestrian/Bicycle Coordinator, provided an overview of safety trends and the Strategic Highway Safety Plan.

Member Questions and Comments:

It would be good to have information on the number of pedestrians and bicyclists involved in crashes that were impaired.

Do we have data on pedestrian and bicycle exposure or usage?

The SHSP includes numbers based on population, but no information on miles traveled.

There is a large disparity in the data. Out of total crashes there is a very small number of fatalities, but in total number of pedestrian and bicycle crashes there is a much greater proportion resulting in fatalities.

The consequence of crashes is much greater for pedestrians and bicyclists than for automobile occupants. There is a direct conflict between the objectives of auto “vehicle” safety and pedestrian safety. As we make bigger and safer automobiles, people are willing to take more risk resulting in more risk for pedestrians. Also, large turning radius to make turning maneuvers easier for vehicles, increase travel speed and put pedestrians in greater danger.

Does the data include information about causation?

We break crash data down by age, jurisdiction, county, and lighting. We are mapping crash data to identify where there are a large number of pedestrian crashes. The Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicle website has crash data on it.

Behavior and safety are interrelated – getting impaired drivers off the road, improves safety for all roadway users.

There is a conflict between capacity and safety. How does FDOT break those conflicts down?

It depends on the specific situation and the priorities.

What about demographic data such as ethnicity, race, and income? Does FDOT intend to do a more detailed crash analysis?

Have looked at race and ethnicity and have not found any trends. There are a significant number of nighttime crashes involving pedestrians and bicyclists.

Presentation – Statewide Transportation Planning

Brad Thoburn, the State Transportation Development Administrator, provided an overview of the transportation planning process.

Member Questions and Comments:

Revenue reductions are a key point to make in moving forward for this Council. A great deal of work has been postponed. We need to be cognizant of the resources that government is working with.

It is impressive that FDOT is looking at 50 years into the future. In this time period we would have to consider climate change and potential impacts of sea level rise. Is this being considered?

Yes, it is being considered in multiple advisory groups. There are multiple forecasts for sea level rise – we are having FAU conduct a research study to assembly information about the .

It would be interesting to know the impact on bike and pedestrian projects/programs with the funding reductions. Local UPWPs have been very significantly cut as a result of revenue decreases. The State should be evaluating the longer-term impact of the reductions. Private industry has been aggressively reacting to these recent changes.

Our transportation plan doesn't account for user costs of using the system (e.g., fuel costs). We need to be able to adequately cost out our alternatives.

The State will continue to grow, and we will need entirely new ways needed to fund transportation.

More communities are using alternative transportation modes (e.g., golf carts, neighborhood electric vehicles - NEVs).

Next Steps and Assignments

Members were asked to fill out evaluation forms (see results in Appendix A).

Staff will send out a calendar form to identify next meeting time, proposed for late September or early October. The Council will be meeting quarterly. Staff will send out interim communication to keep everyone in the loop and keep momentum going. Staff will include information about bicycle facilities and how to use public transportation to get to meetings in future meeting announcements.

Staff will work with Chair to revise the charge, identify materials to address parking lot issues and continue work on the white paper to provide background information on related policies and procedures.

During the next meeting, we will focus on reviewing the revised charge, provide presentations on some of the parking lot issues and discuss the white paper.

Public Comment Period

None received.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm.

APPENDIX A: Meeting Evaluation Summary
Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership Council
1st Council Meeting
 Tallahassee, Florida
 June 28, 2010 – 11:00 pm to 4:00 pm

	<u>Agree</u>		<u>Disagree</u>	
	5	4	3	2
		<u>CIRCLE ONE</u>		
		1		

WERE THE MEETING OBJECTIVES MET?

• To receive informational briefings on roles/responsibilities for transportation decision making, safety trends and the Strategic Highway Safety Plan, and statewide transportation planning	5	7	1	0	0	4 3 1
• To review Council responsibilities, discuss major issues to be addressed	8	4	1	0	0	4 5 4
• To agree on next steps, assignments, and the preparation for the 2 nd Council Meeting to be held in Fall 2010	6	5	1	0	0	4 4 2

MEETING ORGANIZATION

• Background and agenda packet were helpful	8	3	2	0	0	4 4 6
• Presentations were effective and informative	7	5	1	0	0	4 4 6
• Plenary discussion format was effective	7	4	2	0	0	4 3 8
• Facilitator guided participant efforts effectively	9	3	1	0	0	4 6 2

- Participation was balanced

6 5 2 0 (4
·
3
1

What Did You Like Best About the Meeting?

- Broad perspectives gained from different agencies’ viewpoints.
- Kept presentations brief but still allowed time for discussion.
- The amount of experience from all levels and corners of local/state government. Brainstorming was very informative.
- Safety and funding.
- Good composition.
- Introduction of participants and subject matter.
- Opportunity to shape FDOT Plan Process, exchange between stakeholders on needs/desires.
- Chance to hear various points of view.
- It has a balanced and good number of “Partners.”
- Presenters were very knowledgeable. Participants represented diverse interests and background.

What Could Be Improved?

- More specificity as to end goals and “deliverables.”
- Drill into safety stats to drive discussion on how/what to change.
- Earlier in the day. My attention span is better before lunch.
- For future meetings, plan to facilitate input/recommendations for specific issues.
- More detailed presentations from members.
- All of the comments and input was good guidelines.

Other Comments (use the back if necessary)

- More clarity of what the Council’s authority and responsibility are. Meeting well organized. Great facility, A/V, and logistical support by FDOT staff.
- Great job!
- E-mails will be helpful.
- The background and agenda packets could have been online before the meeting. (i.e. power points)
- This was a good meeting. Very informative and open. Good job!
- There is a high need for education in our charge. It appears to be getting broader, not more narrow and specific.
- Lunch period too long- would prefer shorter lunch or working lunch and finish earlier. Please specify if lunch is working lunch or not- wasn’t clear. Ordering in lunch was appreciated-thanks! Purpose of

the meeting was a bit unclear. Consequently discussion wandered away from Bike/Ped focus. Interaction among council members was most valuable but could have been better focused. Presentations could have been done via webinar. Long way to travel to hear presentations. Would prefer more time for focused discussion among council members. For example: schedule webinar on funding versus using meeting time - so those familiar with topic can multi-task.