

Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC)

Joint BAC-PAC Virtual Meeting on Microsoft Teams, Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Meeting Recording: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ajx8VWs9L6Y> Some slide presentations may also be available

ARLNow News story:

<https://www.arlnow.com/2025/10/16/members-of-arlington-pedestrian-and-bicycle-panels-push-back-against-role-changes/>

Minutes, approved unanimously by PAC members present, November 19, 2025

PAC Attendees: Eric Goodman, Acting PAC Chair; Pamela Van Hine, PAC Recording Secretary; John Armstrong; David Earley, new PRC Liaison to PAC; Jim Feaster, Ambar Pankaj; David Patton, Bicycle & Pedestrian Planner; Mary Dallao, Director, Active Transportation Programs

BAC Attendees: Cynthia Palmer, Chair; Dana Bres; David Ansell; Gillian Burgess; Eliot Forster-Benson; Eric Goodman; Mike Hanna; Noreen Hannigan; Andrew Martin; Steve Offutt; Aaron Schuetz; Chris Slatt; Elwyn Gonzalez, Bicycle Planner; Lauren Hassel, BikeArlington
(Note: The County officially added several new BAC members)

Guests: County: Hui Wang, Deputy Director, DES (Speaker) and Valerie Mosley, Bureau Chief, Transportation Planning & Capital Projects Management; BAC friends: Collier Cook and Randy Swart

The PAC Acting Chair and BAC Chair called the joint meeting to order at 7:01 PM and welcomed members, staff, and guests. Attendees briefly introduced themselves. There were no public speakers or Chair reports.

Hui Wang, Deputy Director DES: Conversation with BAC-PAC about Relationships

The speaker proposed three broad categories for BAC-PAC participation in the County's transportation planning and programs: 1) Continue to help at the **project level** through public engagement, report MOT and other issues through Report a Problem, and track notices on County transportation projects and commercial development – and provide bike-ped feedback. 2) Continue to help at **planning level** through participation in County planning efforts (i.e. MTP Update, Comprehensive Plan Update, Vision Zero Action Plan Update) and engaging in process for future planning studies through coordinated committee feedback. And 3) **Expand ways to Help** through advocacy for expansion of laws and local authority, e.g. for use of speed cameras beyond school zones. Express support for ongoing initiatives of value, offer feedback on the prioritization of maintenance of sidewalks and bike facilities, help evaluate new materials used in bike-ped projects, such as PBLs, and share new design treatments and technology, experiences, and ideas.

BAC-PAC response (some staff responses added):

- How to participate in specific projects: The committee needs a heads up that project engagement is coming. Response: Assign specific PAC or BAC members to specific events, give BAC-PAC feedback at meetings, send a group response. The online comment period is several weeks.
- The current public engagement is often trivial – i.e. light design and public art, and is not early enough in the planning process. How does the County go from preliminary to almost 100%? County process: What's needed, preliminary plan, more feedback. Can plans be posted to the site? Speaker response: Plans are not clear to the general public, often taken too literally and when necessary details are changed, the public can be upset. But the BAC-PAC does have the expertise to evaluate plans. BAC-PAC response: Show us the work. Speaker response: Time constraints for staff – takes longer.
- The speaker asked what is missing? Unclear why the County has BAC and PAC advisory groups given that BAC-PAC **advice** is not being **sought nor used**, Committee specific recommendations are lost, projects can

take longer and cost more without input of advisory groups. Staff are not communicating key information to committees to allow us to help or advise. Speaker response: All opinions are valued. The County wants groups to feel valued. 6 Step Engagement is designed to capture a bigger and more diverse group of citizens. How to provide more intentional engagement. BAC-PAC response: We want to **be valued**, not to “**feel**” valued. County response: Participation in the MTP update as a model.

- BAC-PAC: The committee is not an advocacy organization; the BAC-PAC must go through County Manager only. The BAC-PAC is not permitted to advocate as a committee, only as individuals or through advocacy organizations.
- BAC-PAC: The BAC and the PAC have so much technical/engineering and observational expertise – BAC-PAC members could probably describe to staff every curb cut in the County – and that commitment and expertise is being under-utilized by County leadership and staff. If it’s a matter of too many meetings, too little staff time, then we are happy to meet together as we do regularly. Vulnerable road users in the BAC, PAC, and perhaps also the Disability Advisory Commission would happily meet *together* with DES every couple of months or whatever interval works. Sometimes it only takes a five minute conversation to lead to mistakes averted and money saved.
- BAC: When we met with County Manager Schwartz last March, following our March 2025 and November 2024 letters, we raised with him many of these same concerns, as outlined in our September 2025 letter. Mr. Schwartz said that instead of providing input on specific intersections and road safety problems, we should work on design standards and policies for all of Arlington. We are very open to recommending design standards, but (1) to do so would require access to documents and data about existing standards and operations, and (2) we don’t want to step on staff toes. A related question is whether the County would consider the development of an MTP design guidelines manual that could be updated every couple of years. We would be happy to participate in creating such a document. Speaker reply: Lots of design standards (high quality, science based) already exist. MUTCD is an opportunity to make changes though. BAC and PAC should focus on what we DON’T LIKE – and why (evaluating existing standards that are used in the County). We need to use resources efficiently – rebuild trust.

BAC-PAC Business:

- PAC minutes approved [draft minutes from September 10, 2025 joint BAC-PAC meeting](#)
- Mary Dallao: [Lighten Up Arlington](#) – 4-6PM: Rosslyn: 10/28 @ Custis Trail @ Lynn; 10/29 National Landing @ Water Park entrance to the CCC; 10/30 W&OD Trail @ Columbia Pike
- Elwyn announced that the BAC now has 14 official members.

Pamela Van Hine, PAC Representative, and Mike Hanna, BAC Representative: [Arlington’s Transportation Future Advisory Group](#) Update:

The speakers quickly reviewed the contents of the 9/11 Advisory Group meeting:

- Discussed how the modal networks will be developed and prioritized in the County,
- Showed the draft modal maps,
- Raised PAC and BAC concerns about how the modal networks will be developed and implemented (see slide text below),
- Discussed the two homework assignments: BAC and PAC comments on the modal maps and suggested opportunities and challenges for the implementation of the approved transportation goals.
- Ms. Van Hine also encouraged attendees to watch [Kristin Calkins' 9/11 presentation](#).

Pedestrian Perspectives – good news!

- Pedestrian modal prioritization means that the County plans to allocate sufficient space for pedestrian comfort, safety, and convenience before allocating space for other transportation modes.

- The pedestrian infrastructure guidelines in the current Pedestrian Element are often inadequate and need updating.
- The PAC will need to advocate strongly for policies and strategies that meet the needs of pedestrians of all ages, abilities, and backgrounds.
- When a corridor is transit priority, the PAC will need to advocate for additional pedestrian space as bicyclists/micromobile riders may share the sidewalk. These sidewalks will also be busier because of transit riders.

BAC Perspectives – A Bit More Concern:

- Assumption that all roads will accommodate (and potentially prioritize?) motor vehicles.
- Some of the routes reflect the existing Bike Element, but not all.
- Unclear as to the meaning of "Priority 2" - without clear design standards.
- Unclear how motor vehicle traffic and parking would/could be impacted along a priority corridor. When asked, staff answered that this would be a matter of policy to be set later.
- Should we identify the ultimate best route or the route most likely to see reasonable improvements?

BAC-PAC comments:

- County resources currently prioritize cars, not pedestrians. Will priorities change to develop the modal networks? Dangerous intersections are not listed as "gaps"... even the Arlington Loop intersections remain very scary and unsafe for bicycle riders and pedestrians alike. To what standard will the County bring the newly designated bike/ped routes given that even our much-acclaimed Loop remains so dangerous? And will upgrades happen only when roads need new paving for cars?
- Conflict between bike-transit prioritization seems incorrect vs conflicts with cars. Response: Theoretically bikes and transit will have higher priority. Many current transportation projects are decreasing spaces/lanes for cars – usually to add bike lanes, but often new transit lanes too.
- Where will cars go? Staff are not limiting where cars can go. Plans currently get piecemeal ped routes. Transit routes don't currently work for many, e.g going to Wakefield HS.
- The modal priority maps are just where networks should be, not providing detailed infrastructure. Get the modal maps right NOW, then push for engagement and more detailed policies. Be specific with comments – for all modes: transit/bike/peds. Note missing transportation routes to specific places, many of which are NOT on major corridors (i.e. schools).

Comments on MTP Update Modal Map in the Chats:

1) Where do the cars go? It seems like these maps commit to allowing cars everywhere they can currently go, which is a problem. Specifically, all of those neighborhood streets that are grey on the priority map can be expected to see increased volume as drivers avoid routes with better space for people biking/transit. During the FAAC meeting discussion, many members expressed concerns about drivers switching to neighborhood streets.

2) If everywhere is a priority for pedestrians, then nowhere is a priority. How do we know where we need to make improvements for people walking? It sounds like staff is thinking we will not propose any projects for the purpose of improving space for pedestrians, but when there is a project, they will design the space for pedestrians first?

3) Transit. We were told during the TSP (transit strategic plan) that we weren't going to fundamentally rethink transit routes because the MTP update was coming up. Now in the MTP update, we're looking at the transit routes resulting from the TSP. **We need to seriously improve transit routing if we're going to get people out of cars, and it seems like DES staff is precluding that.**

The PAC Acting Chair and BAC Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:10 PM. Note: The **November 12th PAC meeting has been moved to Wednesday, November 19**, because both D. Patton and P. Van Hine need to attend the

meeting on the Comprehensive Plan Update on November 12th. They will report on the Comprehensive Plan Update, and Ms. Van Hine will update the PAC on the MTP Update Advisory Group's October 22nd meeting. We hope that you will watch the [Comprehensive Plan Update](#) on the 12th and participate in the virtual [PAC](#) meeting on the 19th. Watch the PAC page for the PAC meeting details closer to the meeting date.

The next **BAC meeting will be held on Monday November 3rd** from 7 to 9 pm.