



Task Force Meeting 2 Summary Notes

Tuesday, September 26, 2017

1PM – 3:30 PM

Task Force Members:

Ragina Cooper Averella, Captain Charles Baker, Shayne Boucher, Vincent Boylan, Delegate Andrew Cassilly, Nick Driban (for Mike Lenhart), Douglass List (for Senator Roger Manno), Chris Eatough, Tom Gianni, Tom Huesman, Jon Korin, Laurie Lemieux, Mark Morelock, Peter Sotherland, Mayor Patrick Wojahn, Chief Michael Wynnyk, Corporal Dave Zanon

Task Force Members Not Present:

Delegate Stephen Lafferty, Senator Susan Lee

MDOT Staff Present:

Marty Baker (MDOT TSO), Stacey Beckett (MDOT SHA), Virginia Burke (MDOT TSO), Deborah Haynie (MDOT TSO), Kelly Melhem (MDOT MVA), Oluseyi Olugbenle (MDOT TSO)

Consulting Staff Present:

Leigh-Ann Dawes, Susan Sharp, and Stephanie Weber (Sharp & Company), Alia Anderson and Darren Flusche (Toole Design), Bryon White (Sabra Wang and Associates)

Members of the Public:

Josh Feldmark, Kim Lamphier, Marieannette Otero

Welcome and Introductions (Chair and All – 10 mins)

The Chair asked Task Force members for any comments on the Draft Meeting 1 Notes. The Task Force did not provide additional comments. The Meeting Notes, along with the Meeting Strategy document and PowerPoint presentations, will be posted online at

http://www.mdot.maryland.gov/newMDOT/Planning/Bike_Walk/Task-Force.html.

The Chair noted that a Working Draft of a Context Paper for the topics presented at Meeting 1 will be distributed at the end of the meeting. The Working Draft is not for public distribution but should be considered a work in progress by the Task Force. Task Force members are encouraged to review the Working Draft and provide comments to Marty Baker via email so that it may be revised further. A new Working Draft Context Paper will be distributed at each meeting for the topics presented and discussed at the preceding meeting. Once reviewed by the Task Force, Context Papers will become the basis for the Task Force's Report to the Legislature.

In addition, hard copies of the agenda, meeting 1 summary notes, and context paper 1 were made available to Task Force members.



TASK FORCE TO STUDY BICYCLE SAFETY ON MARYLAND HIGHWAYS

Recap of Key Issues/Discussion Points from Meeting One (Chair and Task Force Consultant Team – 10 mins)

Additional data about crashes was presented by the Chair, including partial data for 2016 and early 2017, and crash rates per population of 10,000 in five jurisdictions. Additional material about the League of American Bicyclists' (LAB) ranking of Maryland was also presented.

A recap of key issues identified in meeting 1 included:

- The need to collect economic and health impact data;
- Need for coordination between local jurisdictions and the State needed;
- Need for education.

Drafting Process and Structure for Final Report (Chair and Task Force Consultant Team - 10 mins)

A brief presentation was given on the planned structure for the meetings, the role of the Task Force, the structure of the required report, and the process by which the Task Force will formulate its recommendations.

Meeting 1 Follow Up: Legislative Tools and Operation/Presentation, Discussion, and Preliminary Recommendations (Task Force members and Consultant Team – 30 mins)

During the discussion for preliminary recommendations, the Task Force focused on the need for funding, routes, and available space for cyclists. These were added to the list of issue areas for consultants to research and bring back to the Task Force.

Specifically, the Task Force recommends defining Vulnerable Users, and using model language proposed by League of American Bicyclists (LAB) as a first draft for any proposed legislation. Task Force also noted that the goals to be achieved with legislation should be clear. The Task Force wanted to limit its recommendations regarding CN to bicycles, as legislation could otherwise become broad with far-reaching implications and impacts. The consulting team will follow-up with research on model legislation. The Task Force also preferred to separate venerable road users and contributory negligence issues.

The Task Force acknowledged the issues with the three-foot law and will not attempt to find a resolution (as it would need more time and discussion than is available).

Other ideas proposed to be included in the list of Key Legislative Issues: Funding, with the goal to improve connectivity in the bicycle infrastructure network; designation of priority bicycle routes to receive priority funding; identifying legal barriers to building bike paths (e.g. Building codes).



TASK FORCE TO STUDY BICYCLE SAFETY ON MARYLAND HIGHWAYS

Discussion: Infrastructure and Policy Issues Areas and Best Practice Research Needs. Infrastructure, Policy Tools, and Design Guidance (45 mins)

The Task Force asked about the use of all available tools and emerging tools in determining infrastructure needs (e.g. STRAVA heat maps, user-generated data, etc.).

Proposals by Task Force members for defining the best state of bicycle infrastructure included: supporting a high standard of connectivity; reducing conflicts between bicycles and motor vehicles; reducing vehicles speeds in areas with a high potential for conflict between vehicles and bicycles; inclusive of recreational and long-distance bicycle trails in addition to transportation trails; allocating space for bicycle infrastructure in corridors where space is a limited resource; identifying a mode share goal for bicycling (eg. 3%) from which implementation steps could follow.

The Task Force discussed design treatments considered for different situations, e.g. staggered crossings, and processes for changing how design treatments are determined. The MDOT SHA follows processes defined in federal legislation or in the MUTCD or AASHTO guidelines to inform the MD MUTCD and to consider different design treatments. The MDOT SHA cautions against legislating design treatments and is open to a review of the effectiveness of processes.

There was discussion of staffing and training associated with building bicycle infrastructure. Pennsylvania may have a model program. The Task Force Consultant team will follow up.

The Task Force acknowledged difficulties associated with funding the ongoing maintenance of infrastructure. The discussion on infrastructure and policy issue areas and best practice research needs led to more issue areas for the Task Force. The Task Force provided ideal infrastructure recommendations like protected bike lanes, connectivity trip generators, speed reduction facilities, signalized crossing for cyclists, and improving available space.

The Task Force also suggested internal processes to consider a level of service of cyclists when planning new projects. The group also emphasized the need to think of dividing time for prioritized use of limited infrastructure, for example through more use of High-Intensity Activated crossWalk (HAWK) signals (also known as Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons). It was also emphasized that signals should be designed to give cyclists more time to cross dangerous intersections and assist with signal detection for bikes.

Public Comment

Opportunity for public comment was provided at the meeting, but no attending members of the public chose to contribute. As of this meeting, the Task Force had also received no public comments via the website and e-mail address provided: BikeSafetyTaskForce@mdot.state.md.us

After further discussion from Task Force members, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30pm.