



BPAC Infrastructure and Design Conference Call February 12, 2015, 10am

Participants:

Gregory Krykewycz – DVRPC, Cassidy Boulan – DVRPC, Patrick Farley - Cross County Connections TMA, David Cox – Urban Engineers, Jerry Foster – Greater Mercer TMA, James Sinclair – Rutgers-VTC

1. DVRPC recently released data for “CyclePhilly”
 - a. DVRPC worked to develop smartphone route choice survey for bicyclists
 - b. Has been available since May 2014 for users to track their rides
 - c. Data is mostly for city of Philadelphia, not much in suburbs
 - d. Took a lot of work to get the GPS data to properly show road segments
 - i. Especially in urban core, where phone GPS can have problems
 - ii. Issues in unmapped parks
 - e. <http://www.dvrpc.org/webmaps/CyclePhilly/>
 - i. Can view summarized data, as a 6-month total and by trip purpose
 - ii. Click on a street or trail segment to see a summary of that segment’s data
 - iii. Raw data available for download directly through the website (click “tools and data”)
 - f. Greg may present findings at next BPAC meeting, time permitting
2. Camden County Bikes and Trail plan has gone final and is available on the website
 - a. <http://www.dvrpc.org/camcobiketrails/#/update>
 - b. Project that has been worked on over time first with segments and now a county wide network showing facility types, design guidelines and model ordinances
 - c. Meshes with Burlington County bike plan
 - i. Burlington Plan (<http://bikeplan.org/>) was amended based on Camden additions
 - d. Very good bike plan for the region
 - e. Camden plan was adopted even while it was in draft form
3. Collection of resources on <http://njbikeped.org/> website
 - a. Place to show best practices, industry standards, good examples of complete streets etc.
 - b. Lots of people would like to see implementation success examples
 - c. Google doc has one entry, Essex County complete streets implementation plan
 - i. https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1C_FFRvwZm8nNvpCMDDwXuxfRqIrl0SP-Am3oZdVyr6Us/edit#gid=0
 - ii. Will be added to NJ Bike Ped website soon
 - d. Please add other documents and such to the google doc
4. NJDOT discussion with staff, Cassidy to lead
 - a. Find out how bike/ped facilities are being incorporated, or not, in NJ
 - b. We know the high level policy but need to understand what is happening at staff level



- c. Cassidy will reach out with Debbie to see who at NJDOT can be included and get those conversations scheduled.
 - d. Will get rolling over the next few months
5. Bike/ped data standardization
- a. Hoping to use BPAC to understand new safety management system to see if the bike/ped data that is being collected can feed into that
 - b. Needs to be standardized
 - c. Reminder of traffic counter on Ocean City Bridge (52)
 - i. Presentation on this was made during last BPAC meeting
 - ii. Data just began to be processed
 - iii. Data will eventually go online, probably on DOT website
 - d. Scott Brady at DVRPC has been working through TRB national standardization efforts for bike/ped data collection and will be brought into conversation
 - e. Coverage can be issue because Ocean City counter may be the only other counter in NJ for which data is shared
 - i. Should see where we can add more counters to expand the coverage throughout the state
 - f. DVRPC has a systematic bike count program
 - i. Weeklong counts in different areas around the region
 - ii. Includes facilities with sharrows, lanes, trails, etc
 - iii. Various land use contexts
 - iv. Idea is to build a background dataset and return to able to do trend analysis to see how trip making has changed over time in response to policy and infrastructure changes
 - g. Could use BPAC to pursue more systematic efforts on a statewide level
 - h. NJDOT could help in making sure collection is standardized statewide so the data can be used better
 - i. Without standards there will be too much noise.
 - ii. What would/should be statewide priorities for data?
6. Concern over quality of crash data
- a. Collection of data is inconsistent
 - b. Should 5 years of data be standard instead of 3 being used?
 - c. There are crash data refresher courses that are offered to police, may be opportunity to advise how they talk about bike/ped crashes
 - d. DOT (via HSIP), VTC (via causality study), and CAIT have all investigated data quality problem
 - e. Need to coordinate with safety subcommittee to not overlap with them
 - i. See their conference call notes for similar discussion
 - 1. <http://njbikeped.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/NJ-BPAC-Safety-Subcommittee-Meeting-Summary-Dec-2014.pdf>
7. Discussion on next in-person meeting



- a. How are BPAC agendas being established?
 - b. Need to standardize presentations
 - i. Instead of 1 presentation, maybe setting a time, like 30 minutes and having 3 short ones
 - c. Would be good for sub-committees to be better able to control the format of the discussion rather than preselected by DOT
 - i. Maybe themed meetings, where presentations and action items are around one theme
 - ii. Could bring in relevant people to discussion, as in agencies or consultants who have experience with a specific topic
 - iii. Allows sub-committees to “control their destinies”
 - 1. Sub-committees could take turns organizing and programming meetings
8. Discussion on role of group
- a. Will committee encourage DOT to change ped and bike guidelines?
 - i. Will definitely encourage DOT to use emerging resources and new guidelines
 - ii. Want to see state use the latest and greatest
 - b. DOT recognizes that their manual is outdated
 - i. Maybe sub-committee can coax them to welcome additional guidance as adopted practice
 - ii. Better design guidelines already exist, no need to reinvent the wheel
 - 1. Some states have adopted guidance allowing use of NACTO guide
 - a. Feds did too
 - 2. Question of whether NJDOT has done this, and if not this could be quick method to allow new guidelines
 - c. Item 9 (below) is example where a 30-minute discussion in general BPAC meeting could allow for presentation of examples, case law, etc.
 - i. It’s important information to share
 - ii. Valid across multiple sub-committees
 - d. One thing group can do is not just share information but also provide recommendations
 - e. Need to get right people in the room to talk about it to develop action items so after several meetings there can be policy recommendations
9. Miscellaneous discussion (shoulders)
- a. Need to look at issue of shoulders vs bike lanes
 - b. Concerned that cyclists should not be in shoulder but DOT feels that shoulders are bike facilities
 - c. In PA, getting a shoulder on state roads maintained to bicycle quality is considered a victory, in NJ questions of whether it counts as a facility
 - i. NJ Supreme Court ruling looked at bike lanes and shoulders
 - 1. Said that state law requires riding in travel lane and shoulder is not a travel lane
 - 2. Thus shoulders do not have to be maintained to any standard of care
 - 3. However, bike lanes do have to be maintained for safe passage
 - 4. DOT disagrees and says that shoulders count as bike areas



- d. There is legislative solution where the law is changed to define shoulders as bike use, for example
 - i. But a shoulder is only a complete street for a strong and fearless rider. From an 8-80 perspective it's not complete
 - ii. Are we doing least accommodations for people who already bike, or increase bike use?
 - iii. Current definition is simply about safe passage
 - e. Consider working with Legislative Committee on bringing in a speaker to share information and better inform RTAC about bikes using shoulders in NJ
10. End meeting. Notes to be sent out, general BPAC meeting to be March 18, 2015 at 9:30am.