

National Accessibility Evaluation Bike Subgroup Panel Meeting

Notes

August 24, 2017
2:00 - 3:00 p.m. CST

Action items denoted in bold.

Participants:

University of MN: Shannon Engstrom, Brendan Murphy, Andrew Owen
Arkansas DOT: Virginia Porta
DC DOT: Stephanie Dock
Florida DOT: Monica Zhong
Maryland DOT: Stephen Miller
Minnesota DOT: Deanna Belden, Hattie Hiler, Michael Petesch
Virginia DOT: Peter Ohlms, Jeremy Raw

Welcome & Introductions — Andrew Owen

Project Overview — Brendan Murphy

Overview of LTS Levels

- LTS 1:
 - Physically separated from traffic or low-volume, mixed-flow traffic at 25mph or less
 - Bike lanes 6ft wide or more
 - Intersections easy to approach and cross
 - Comfortable for children
- LTS 2:
 - Bike lanes 5.5ft wide or less, next to 30mph auto traffic
 - Unsignalized crossings of up to 5 lanes at 30mph
 - Comfortable for most adults
 - Typical of bicycle facilities in the Netherlands
- LTS 3:
 - Bicycle lanes next to 35mph auto traffic, or mixed-flow traffic at 30mph or less
 - Comfortable for most current U.S. riders
 - Typical of bicycle facilities in United States

**ACCESSIBILITY
OBSERVATORY**

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

- LTS 4:
 - No dedicated bicycle facilities
 - Traffic speeds 40mph or more
 - Comfortable for "strong and fearless" riders (vehicular cyclists)

Project Goals

- Brendan (UMN) provided an overview of the work that is being done around bicycles and accessibility.
 - Determine scalable LTS framework using OSM data
 - Apply LTS in national bicycle accessibility calculations
 - Develop & present metrics assessing quality of bike access

Comment: Jeremy (VDOT) recommended connecting with the Bicycle Network Analysis (BNA) project and specifically Jennifer Bouldy.

Project Timeline

- PTAP subgroup feedback period (2 wks)
- AO implements LTS framework and performs test studies (8 wks)
- Preliminary results shared with subgroup, followed by comment period (2 wks)
- Preliminary results shared with full TAP at Autumn 2017 meeting, followed by comment period (2 wks)
- AO implements full national evaluation, presents draft relevant reporting materials at TRB TAP 2018 meeting.
- Comment: Monica Zhong, FL, noted work being done by [John Pucher](#) at Rutgers that is connected to safety as part of classifications.

Feedback on LTS Framework - as written in memo sent to group before the call

- Input on proposed LTS/OSM approximation
 - Peter recommended incorporating protected bikeway facilities if it exists in the OpenStreetMap data.
- Discussion areas (pg. 3)
 - Comments:
 - Virginia (ADOT) asked how speed limit data is managed in OSM. Brendan and Andrew stated the data comes from TIGER census data and crowdsourcing that is part of OSM.
 - Jeremy (VDOT) mentioned that cross-referencing and merging data is a goal of FHWA. **Andrew and Brendan will keep an eye on this initiative.**
 - Peter (VDOT) wondered if data for smaller streets or local data could be merged and Andrew agreed it might be possible. **Andrew will follow-up with Peter to learn more about what local traffic volume data sets look like and how they might connect to OSM.**

- Brendan noticed that one thing that might be missing is how to incorporate elevation datasets. This could be critical since many individuals may avoid traveling down a street due to elevation. No participants on the call were aware of elevation data for this purpose.
- Peter and Virginia: **Consider including data about heavy bus traffic or pavement changes due to rail tracks** (which can cause damage to bike tires).
- Michael (MnDOT): Asked about roundabouts and road shoulder changes due to road striping or parking changes. Brendan confirmed that roundabouts will be considered unsignalized and they are not currently considering shoulders as bicycling facilities. Including shoulders as bicycle facilities could be problematic (as noted by Michael).
 - In addition, Michael wondered about AADT and vehicle-mixed areas. **Andrew would like to see whether there is data on vehicle mixing available and then see if it can be incorporated into the LTS classifications.**

Proposed Cities

- Minneapolis, D.C., Seattle and Miami are being proposed. Virginia recommended including a smaller city in the first round. **Andrew agreed to consider a smaller to mid-sized city and will connect with Virginia offline.** Virginia recommended Little Rock, Memphis or northwest corner of Arkansas.

Review Next Steps — Andrew Owen

- Notes from meeting will be distributed.
- UMN will continue to receive feedback through end of August.
- UMN will reach out to pilot cities.
- Overview of this call will be shared at full TAP meeting on September 12.

The call adjourned at 3:02 pm.