

**Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC)**  
**Joint BAC-PAC Meeting, held virtually via Microsoft TEAMS, January 11, 2023 7PM**  
Meeting recording: Slide deck (E Gonzalez): Slide deck (A. Bullock):  
MINUTES (approved unanimously by quorum of PAC members February 8, 2023)

PAC Attendees: Elizabeth Gallagher, Chair; Eric Goodman, Vice Chair; Pamela Van Hine, Recording Secretary; Jim Feaster; Eric Goldstein; Tom Kornis; Chris Yarie; David Patton, Bicycle & Pedestrian Planner; Henry Dunbar, Director of Operations for Active Transportation (representing Mary Dallao, WalkArlington)

*BAC Attendees:* Cynthia Palmer, Chair; Steve Offutt, Vice Chair; Gillian Burgess; Eric Goodman; Mike Hanna; Noreen Hannigan; Megan Jones; Chris Slatt; Leah Garber, Active Transportation Manager; Raymond Duran, BikeArlington Program Manager

*Other Attendees:* Invited Speakers: Elwyn Gonzalez, Transportation Planner, DES/DOT; Allison Bullock, Transportation Planning Manager, DES/DOT; Representatives of other groups: Majdi Shomali, C2E2; Jay Corbalis, JBG Smith; Matt Jones, National Landing BID; Public attendees: Kenny Preniczky (Wakefield student); Collier Cook; Randy Swart

The PAC and BAC Chairs called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM and welcomed BAC-PAC members, staff, and guests. Neither Chair had a Report, and there were no public comments.

**Elwyn Gonzalez, Transportation Planner, DES/DOT: Protected Bike Lane Quick Build Projects**

This new County program adds protections to existing bike facilities currently lacking full protection, based upon several criteria. Criteria focus on improving bike lanes that will have the most impact on safety for all users, by including factors such as connectivity to the overall network, key locations (schools, transportation hubs, County facilities), predicted demand, and improved comfort and safety. Cost effectiveness, congestion relief, low impact on natural resources, and ease of implementation are among the secondary criteria. Prioritization is tied to other County guidelines and priorities: equity, Vision Zero, ROW responsibility, destination accessibility, multimodal connectivity, and existing facility conditions. Bikeways are evaluated, scored and ranked, projects are planned and designed, then built. Coordinating these bike facility improvements with other ongoing transportation projects is a key component of cost containment and resource sharing. The speaker talked about plans for Quincy (between Washington and 10<sup>th</sup>), which has a crash history and driveway conflicts, but opportunities with a new floating bus facility and room for additional bike protection, as well as links to the 11<sup>th</sup> Street bikeway (slide 6, other examples on slides 7 and 8). Recent PBL added to S. Clark Street as part of the CCBN show an example of preferred materials: precast concrete barrier curbs, 6" tall (or 4" tall if fire department needs access). The speaker noted that bike facilities can vary along a specific route, i.e. Langston Blvd., so designs may vary. Crash rates are scored as crashes/mile.

*Comments:*

- Will data be shared (yes)
- Air quality: Glad that it's part of the assessment.
- Is quick-build a misnomer? Not compared to more major rebuilds/enhancements, which may need to be the CIP. Can quick-builds include other safety features, such as signaling? No – Adding these features makes the project more expensive and challenging. Staff findings can help prioritize CIP project needs.
- How can quick-build projects improve intersection safety?
- Can schools be a priority? Also ensure building for kids and for larger bikes. It's good to keep using flex posts when more protective materials cannot be used. Flex posts make it clear that space is for cyclists, not drivers.
- Can the County develop one prototype model, based upon NACTO guidelines? No – each location has different challenges.
- What's the best way to keep drivers out of bike lanes? H. Dunbar offered to work with the speaker on shared bike lane blockage and reporting. Need to fix Report a Problem so cyclists can report blockages more easily – and address those not necessarily tied to construction conflicts.
- Safe bike lanes are better for students – faster and more convenient, flexible times.
- How are new PBL prioritized?

**Leah Gerber, Active Transportation Manager, BAC Liaison, and David Patton, Bicycle & Pedestrian Planner, PAC Liaison: Engagement Opportunities**

The speakers encouraged members to complete the online [National Park Service \(NPS\) survey for improvements to the Mt. Vernon Trail and George Washington Memorial Parkway](#) (due Wednesday, January 18), regularly review the [Engage Arlington](#) feedback opportunities, and sign up for various County-related [e-newsletters](#) of interest. NPS survey comments are not limited to just the Proposed Actions and Alternatives. Please submit comments on any areas and issues that you feel need improvement, such as stormwater, dangerous curves, drinking fountains, bathrooms, and landscaping.

**Allison Bullock, Transportation Planning Manager, DES/DOT and County liaison for the VDOT Route 1 Project: A Discussion of Arlington County's Role on the [VDOT Route 1 Multimodal Improvements Phase 2 Plans](#)**

The County provides guidance to VDOT to ensure that projects are consistent with the transportation and planning guidelines followed by the County. For the Route 1 project, guidelines include the Crystal City Sector Plan, the Crystal City Multimodal Transportation Study, and the Crystal City Bike Network, as well as the County's Master Transportation Plan and Vision Zero Action Plan, and non-County guidelines such as NACTO. Many of these guidelines are different from those that VDOT typically uses for highway design, which are often not appropriate for a major arterial in a dense urban multimodal environment that prioritizes safety for all users over vehicular throughput.

For the response to VDOT's Phase 2 proposals this summer, County staff reviewed all applicable guidelines and prepared a chart with specific recommendations to guide the ongoing study and development of an at-grade Route 1. The chart is supplemented through an appended report that provides supporting details on the cited specific recommendations.

Over the past year, some VDOT plans have aligned more closely with County recommendations, such as a 25 MPH speed limit and considering bike lanes and off-peak parking. But the VDOT proposed cross-sections for Route 1 do not support County recommendations, which include narrower travel lanes, a consistent 87' curb-to-curb width along the entire project length, additional traffic calming methods to reduce speeds, and a wider total ROW (160' vs. 140') north of 18<sup>th</sup> Street. County staff continue to meet with VDOT staff to reach consensus, and the County report can be considered a "snapshot in time" rather than a final report. For instance, the County report says little about TDM and nothing about plans for 18<sup>th</sup> Street, both of which are of high interest to the BAC-PAC and the community. The speaker said that they are interested in seeing more data from VDOT on how VDOT plans would work before making additional recommendations. For example, coordinating a Barnes Dance signalization with the rest of the traffic signals along Route 1, while ensuring sufficient pedestrian time for crossing without a total cycle length that is too long will be difficult. Appropriate coordinated progressive signalization along Route 1 is critical to slow traffic down to a safe speed without causing gridlock. County staff do understand the importance of a truly regional TDM program and will continue to push VDOT for one.

The speaker noted that County Transportation Director Dennis Leach's last day will be on Friday, January 13.

*Comments and Questions: (Additional unanswered questions in the Chat will be addressed by the Speaker later)*

- Double row of trees along the wide median: Some members strongly supported them; some thought one row was enough and the additional space should go to the bike-ped space.
- Ensure that VDOT does provide and implement an appropriate TDM plan soon.
- Work with VDOT to improve the design of 18<sup>th</sup> Street: Encourage the evaluation of a 3-lane alternative to the existing 4-5 lane width on 18<sup>th</sup>, which would provide sufficient space for PBL, additional space for a Dutch underpass (much desired by the community), and a shorter crossing distance for pedestrians, thus a shorter crossing time with a Barnes Dance signalization.
- Request for meeting of Livability Route 1 Working Group with VDOT and County Staff. The speaker said she would pursue it.
- Cafe zone: Ensure that the clear zone sidewalk is designed to meet the minimum widths proposed – and will not be diminished by cafe zone encroachment. The speaker said that a continuous retail environment along Route 1 is not envisioned by the County – as parallel streets, such as Crystal Drive, will have these already. Commenter urged the County to be prepared to protect the clear zones from developers' plans. The speaker acknowledged that Route 1 might have a few developers who will want to add cafe zones. The shy zone can accommodate some of that space, and the developer could propose additional space through their site plan. She will take this cautionary recommendation back to CPHD staff.
- What are enforcement plans? It's too early to include these – but they part of ongoing discussions.
- THANKS to the speaker for the presentation and discussion, and to the County for this report – a major improvement over many of the VDOT plans to date!

**PAC-BAC Business:**

- Approval of the [draft minutes from the December 5, 2022](#) joint BAC-PAC meeting:
  - Moved, seconded, approved without objection by the quorums of BAC and PAC members present.
- Current PAC membership status: E. Goldstein asked D. Patton if PAC membership ended in 2022 and needed to be renewed. D. Patton agreed that he needed to reach out to the County Manager's office to renew PAC members status.

The BAC and PAC Chairs adjourned the meeting at 9:03 PM. The next [BAC](#) meeting will be Monday February 6, the next [PAC](#) meeting will be Wednesday, February 8. Watch both pages for details on February meetings.

**Post-meeting Informal Budget Discussion:** The Chairs apologized for running out of time to discuss the budget during the formal meeting and encouraged attendees to stay for an informal discussion of budget requests. Next Tuesday, the Chairs will be participating in a group discussion about budget priorities with the County Manager and other C&C Chairs, so BAC-PAC input is needed NOW. The group agreed that Vision Zero should be included; the Neighborhood Complete Streets Program cannot use more funds at this time because of challenges filling existing positions. E. Goldstein suggested several "enforcement" needs: MOT inspectors, crossing guards, and sidewalk "enforcement" (ensuring that the responsible property owner of commercial developments repairs damaged sidewalks in a timely manner). These ideas were supported by several attendees. Some brainstorming yielded thoughts on how to make the programs self-supporting through fees. The Chairs encouraged everyone to continue to send them ideas over the weekend. Based upon the outcome of the meeting with the County Manager next week, the Chairs may decide to submit a formal letter (or letters). BAC-PAC members and staff, who stayed for the budget discussion, completed their discussion at 9:27 PM.