

Pedestrian Advisory Committee and Bicycle Advisory Committee
Virtual Joint BAC-PAC Meeting via Microsoft TEAMS
Monday, June 7, 2021 7 P.M. – 9 P.M.

This meeting was recorded: <https://youtu.be/9MOoXcUGZKI>

Slide decks are here: <https://commissions.arlingtonva.us/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2021/06/Robert-Capper-Trails-Modernization-Joint-PAC-BAC-Meeting.pptx> and <https://commissions.arlingtonva.us/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2021/06/Dan-Reinhard-VDOT-update-Rt-1-in-Crystal-City-BAC-PAC-2021.06.07.pdf>

Minutes - Approved by PAC, with edits, July 14, 2021

PAC Attendees: Eric Goldstein Chair; Eric Goodman, Vice Chair; Pamela Van Hine, Recording Secretary; Jim Feaster; Elizabeth Gallagher; Patrick Kenney; Chris Yarie; David Patton, Bike & Pedestrian Planner; Mary Dallao, WalkArlington Program Manager

BAC Attendees: Elizabeth Kiker, Chair; Cynthia Palmer, Vice Chair; Dana Bres; Gillian Burgess; Eric Goodman; Mike Hanna; Noreen Hannigan; Megan Jones; Steve Offutt; Tim Rosato; Aaron Schuetz; Staff: Leah Gerber, Active Transportation Coordinator; Jason Widstrom

Guests: Speakers: Robert Capper, Department of Parks & Recreation, Arlington County; VDOT staff & consultants: Dan Reinhart, Geoff Giffin, John Martin
Staff: Benjamin Aiken, Director, Constituent Services, County Manager's Office; Alison Bullock, Transportation Planning Manager, DOT; Other Commissioners: C2E2: Emily Emery, Majdi Shomali
22202 Community: AHCA: Natasha Atkins; Alistair Watson; ARCA: Susan English; Arthur Fox; CCCCA: Judy Freshman, Carol Fuller; CCCRC: Christer Ahl; JBG Smith: Robert Vaughn; National Landing BID: Malaika Scriven.
Other guests: Gordon Chaffin, Street Justice/Everything but Cars; David Ansell; Jessica Bloomfield; Joe McAndrew, Vice President, [Greater Washington Partnership](#); Em Mclau; Charlie Denney, Senior Bicycle and Pedestrian Planner, Volkert, Inc.; Collier Cook; DH Lust; Randy Swart

The BAC and PAC Chairs called the meeting to order at 7:03 P.M. and welcomed BAC-PAC members, staff, and guests. There were no public comments. The BAC Chair reported that the BAC is still actively working on allowing mountain biking in Arlington. The PAC Chair noted that the [proposed CIP](#) is now available and suggested that PAC members review, especially the transportation projects. He also mentioned that approving lowering speeds on several key corridor streets is going to the Board for approval of an advertisement for a public hearing on July 17 (see item 39 in [Agenda](#) for June 12 meeting). L. Gerber introduced Allison Bullock, the new Transportation Planning Manager. A. Bullock noted that she replaces R. Best, who recently retired.

Robert Capper, Capital Asset Manager, Department of Parks & Recreation: Trail and Bridge Modernization Program:

The speaker addressed the upcoming plans, including timing, for trails and bridge projects in the proposed [CIP for Parks & Recreation](#). First is replacement and major renovation of the County's 39.7 miles of off-street, multi-purpose trails that are approaching the end of their useful life: Bluemont Junction Trail, portion of Four Mile Run Trail in Bluemont Park north of Route 50, western end of Lucky Run Trail, middle portion of Route 50 Trail and the Colonial Village Trail (FY22). Next is a consultant study to determine trail pavement conditions to prioritize future segments. Finally, they propose to repair and replace pedestrian bridges and low-water fords on multi-purpose trails and hiking trails: Construction of Glencarlyn Pedestrian Bridge (FY22); Construction of Lubber Run Pedestrian Bridge #2 (FY22); Design (FY22) and Construction (FY23) of Bluemont Pedestrian Bridge; Design (FY22) and Construction (FY23) of Alcova Heights Pedestrian Bridge. Note that all of the bridges are within County park facilities. These pedestrian bridges currently have steps, so are not ADA-compliant.

Discussion:

Trail condition survey: Why repeat a study that was recently done, especially when some of the trails already noted to be in poor condition and in need of repair have not been repaired? The speaker responded that the remaining trails in poor condition are now being repaired, that the new survey would use a new, more appropriate vehicle and an improved system for data collection, and relatively speaking, the survey is a small amount of money.

Repairing the Glencarlyn Bridge: G. Burgess advocated that taking 3 years to repair this bridge is totally unacceptable. The underserved community served by this bridge relies on this bridge because many do not have cars. The alternative path is much further, floods, and is not accessible for many vulnerable citizens. She posited that if this were a bridge for cars, it would have been fixed immediately. Why do bike-ped facilities need to go through such a lengthy process to be repaired? The speaker said that car facilities are 'exempt' from some regulations that apply to bike-ped facilities. The committees agreed that the impediments to bike-ped bridge repair was an important question that needs to be resolved. L. Gerber said that she'd follow-up on this through the trail group. B. Aiken also said he'd follow-up.

Dan Reinhard, Project Manager, VDOT: The VDOT Route 1 Multimodal Improvements Feasibility Study:

The speaker gave a brief overview of the [study](#), which covers Route 1 from 12th to 23rd. with a focus on studying an urban boulevard design, then comparing to Crystal City Sector Plan and no build options. The focus of his presentation is on the at grade urban boulevard design, with a bit of the CCSP proposal. He notes that the VDOT at-grade model moves Route 1 west to slow traffic and adds land for development to the east. In the CCSP model, the bridges remain elevated but are still rebuilt as single span bridges with wider sidewalks. VDOT is currently evaluating future conditions. Studying Fern Street traffic is now included, but "less intensely" than other neighborhood streets. His "outcomes" slide (5) demonstrates that VDOT cannot build a "normal" lane design because it's dangerous for pedestrians. VDOT is currently proposing 7 lanes, 6 lanes, or 7 at 15th and 6 at 18th. How much through traffic can be supported with only 6-7 lanes? VDOT is running a sensitivity analysis right now to determine an adequate LOS. If through traffic volume on Route 1 is reduced, how much traffic will be diverted and where will it go? Transit will pick up some commuters; other transit options are coming; and telework policies may also help. Can driving behavior be modified through TDM? VDOT continues to study and refine their origin and destination data. 60% is through traffic, not going to or from 12th to 23rd, but a significant volume is still to or from the wider 22202 area. See Slide 7, which shows the high volume of Pentagon City traffic traveling to DC, but also to Rosslyn and within the immediate area. Slide 12 shows the project pedestrian volumes at 15th and 18th. Bike routes are not planned along Route 1 but will be available on both Eads and Clark/Bell. High visibility bike crossings over Route 1 are proposed. VDOT is studying the impact of traffic on cyclists, especially along Clark-Bell and Eads. VDOT is using the MWCOG models to determine how changes to Route 1 would limit traffic capacity, and where it would go instead.

The at grade proposal does provide more land for development. Utilities will need to be moved underground under Route 1 in any proposal. VDOT is preparing comparative construction costs and timetables. A draft report is due mid-July, but may be delayed until mid-August final report, and the final report might not be issued until mid-September.

A summary of the BAC-PAC discussion: (DR is Dan Reinhard's response; JM is John Martin's response)

If the goal is to create a walkable urban boulevard, why not start with that design rather than managing car throughput? DR: Starting with 45,000/day, it's a balancing act – how do we create an urban boulevard for Route 1 without growing traffic and creating gridlock? We need to encourage transit use and need to ensure that transit is not impacted by gridlock, especially buses. With the 6-lane option, could the pedestrian refuge median be removed to narrow total crossing distance?

Please keep the pedestrian refuge median for our safety. When will more data be available, and what is the impact on buses with no left turn at 15th? DR: More data will be provided at the public meeting. Yes, VDOT is concerned – and studying – the impact of no left turns on transit. Check out the just posted no build report. If no bike lanes will be provided on Route 1, why not create separate bike lanes with the sidewalk space? This would prevent bike-ped conflict on the sidewalk if separate spaces can be provided. Ensure enough space for

both parties – and an abundant landscaping zone. DR: How the sidewalk space will be used is not part of this project, but, yes, bike lanes might possibly be incorporated.

The measurements of effectiveness appear to focus on 5 – vehicular operations – moving cars, not moving people. If you build for cars, you get cars. Take away space, get fewer cars. The current at-grade proposals are too dangerous for bike-peds. Transportation is not just about cars - or only cars. JM: VDOT started with designing the street space, but the sidewalk – area from the back of the curb to the building edge - could include other functions. If VDOT creates a street that does not accommodate future traffic projections, we need a TDM program to get people to NOT use cars. An at-grade Route 1 cannot not handle all the traffic. With less capacity, cars will go somewhere else, traffic will disperse. Some will switch modes, but some will drive – in neighborhood, GWP, and other routes.

We need a regional TDM for the whole area. DR: VDOT will look at this, as they realize that an at-grade proposal will need a comprehensive regional TDM plan, but it will require another study. DR pointed out that 36% of trips from National Landing are driving into DC – why? TDM must be both regional and local.

Why focus on LOS, rather than more people-oriented perspective (bike-ped-transit)? DR: VDOT is not focused on LOS; VDOT will focus on TDM and their sensitivity analysis. VDOT is getting close to NL BID option, though the BID proposal included LIT lanes, which might be added later. First priority is how to make Route 1 function without diverting traffic into neighborhoods.

Why have a 90' wide crossing? VDOT will show next week.

How will crosswalks be designed in different models? A single stage crossing, similar to Route 50, scares us! Speed limit should be lower than 30mph. DR: VDOT would need a speed study to lower to 25mph or less, and the proximity of I-110 and I-395 make it very hard to lower below 30mph. But if safety is most important, why not?

Consider a 5-lane solution. This proposal looks like a terrifying hybrid of Glebe and Route 50, so why not fewer lanes? Traffic diversion will be on local streets. DR: VDOT could analyze – but chose 6 and 7 lanes to study to see what happens. If lanes are reduced more, can see implications, but not in this study, perhaps in a future study.). If you add bike lanes to the sidewalk space, especially for the 24' sidewalk, there is not enough room for everything (clear zone, bike lanes, landscaping zone, café zone),

Can Route 1 have dedicated transit lanes? Transit priority is needed. DR: Dedicated transit routes are on parallel streets – and diverted traffic could badly impact. Traffic will go to side streets – and impact side streets. BAC Chair: If side streets have limits placed on them, that would help. Using other transportation options is better option. County does have tools to handle diverted traffic.

Maintaining traffic volume means having more cars that CAN divert. We need to PLAN for bike-walk-transit! What is the WHOLE PLAN? And how do cars move through? The proposal can't make the bike-ped-transit-environment WORSE than current conditions. JM: CCSP and CCMMS start with the movement of people. VDOT has looked at bike-ped-transit demand and feels at-grade can accommodate it all. Lanes can accommodate bus routes, but not dedicated bus lanes currently. Perhaps a future plan can include dedicated bus lanes.

BAC Chair: We had hoped for a presentation focused on bike-pedestrian-transit issues, so we are disappointed. Next steps: DR: First we need to get to the end of THIS study! Then go to design phase. The 140' build to width is recommended, but not required. Consider how to add more space, how fill up the space, is it wide enough?

Eric Goldstein and Elizabeth Kiker: BAC-PAC legislation proposals:

The PAC Chair said that the County seeks comments from the Commissions on what is needed from Richmond. In our case, what is needed to improve bike-ped safety and utilization in Arlington. B. Aiken said that he was attending in listening mode. He will take notes back to the County Manager and coordinate input. C. Denney noted Virginia bike-related legislation ideas from M. Tindall: study resolution of Idaho stop (cyclists can yield, rather than coming to a full stop); increase dedicated trail funding; replacing contributory negligence with comparative negligence for bike-ped crashes; requesting a state-wide commitment to Vision Zero; and creating an e-bike rebate. Other thoughts included: restoring budget items that were removed during Covid-time; identifying any proposed bills coming through that could negatively impact bike-ped safety; identifying our natural allies- and working with them. Virginia has approved setting speed limits to less than 20mph – so

Arlington should implement on all residential streets. Staff should justify greater speeds, not less than 20mph, which should be the default. 15mph would be even better! We also need to implement automated speed enforcement in all school zones (and study results). Industry has asked for pause before implementing in other situations, so that it can be studied. We need to implement what we can NOW. Also discussed was the equity of e-bike reimbursements as everyone needs to be able to access them. G. Chaffin says resolving needs to be a regional solution – for e-cars and e-bikes. Dealers can't afford to keep them in inventory without a rebate system. Rather than giving drivers a rebate to offset their car tax, instead pay people for NOT having cars! This would help TDM as well. Streets must be designed to be slow! (G. Chaffin). C. Palmer noted that Brooklyn achieves 5mph through barricades on streets. We also need legislation to ban right on red, require trucks to have side underride guards, ban bull bars, require that drivers automatically fail their driver's test if they fail to look back. E. Goldstein brought up that bike-ped bridge replacement apparently has different requirements than bridges for cars; B. Aiken said he'd check into what regulations apply and what is needed. E. Goldstein noted that County feedback is needed by mid-July, so BAC-PACers should ponder some more submit ideas by then. B. Aiken agreed.

The Chairs adjourned the meeting at 8:55PM. The next PAC meeting will be held virtually on Wednesday, July 14, at 7PM. Watch the [PAC page](#) and Public Google Group for details.