

CR 35-2016

FW: master bike path plan

Sigaty, Mary Kay

Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 10:24 AM**To:** Sayers, Margery**Cc:** CouncilRecords

From: Robin Emrich [mailto:remric@verizon.net]**Sent:** Monday, April 04, 2016 5:08 PM**To:** Terrasa, Jen**Cc:** Fox, Greg; Ball, Calvin B; Weinstein, Jon; Sigaty, Mary Kay**Subject:** master bike path plan

Dear Representative Terrasa:

I ride a bike, I live in the Allview neighborhood (corner of Ferndale & Allview), and I am in favor of the original master bike plan that would bring the bike path through my neighborhood. The only proviso I would have is that it be environmentally sound. As for the destruction of property values, the empirical evidence just doesn't support it, and I doubt that increased crime would result in any significant amount.

I'm sure you'll hear from others on both sides of the environment, property values, and crime issues. But what I can offer you is a personal story with a personal struggle to increase my fitness and decrease my reliance on the car. When the Columbia Archives was downtown, I was a frequent bike commuter from Allview to Downtown (now I walk to our new location as an alternative to the car commute). I would have to ride 3.7 miles each way on streets mainly and some pathways and go through Oakland Mills and across the Rt. 29 bridge, or my more usual route through Hickory Ridge. Neither option was great, and both were fairly strenuous – lot of hills, lots of street cycling with crazy drivers, lots of breathing polluted air (especially at stops for traffic lights), and little environmental beauty. But I did it anyway, because I believe that there are better options than just hopping in a car to do everything! I'm tired of the constant adding 1 more lane to the highways, and now the noise reducing walls. I did this bike commuting fairly regularly since the visit from the former Columbia, Missouri mayor to our Columbia in 2009 until this past August of 2016 when CA moved "in my backyard". I was part of the bike tour that took Mayor Darwin Hindman around our town as we engaged in a discussion about the use of bicycles as transportation.

It would have been incredible to have had the route you are trying to change for my commute to my old workplace. Although I don't work downtown, the possibilities this master plan has for biking to Symphony Woods, to the Movies at Lakefront in the Summer, to the Mall, etc. seem exciting to me. Just think of the connectivity that my neighborhood could have, but does not have currently, with the rest of Columbia – to Downtown – to HCC – to Blandair. I realize that your amended plan will improve the current situation, but it won't go as far as the original plan.

Please reconsider your proposed amendment and see if we can make the original plan work.

Thanks for your time,
Robin E. Emrich

FW: Amendment 1 to CR35-2016

Sigaty, Mary Kay

Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 10:29 AM**To:** Sayers, Margery**Cc:** CouncilRecords

From: Lars Olson [mailto:larsjo@verizon.net]**Sent:** Sunday, April 03, 2016 9:29 PM**To:** Sigaty, Mary Kay**Subject:** Amendment 1 to CR35-2016

Dear Council Member Sigaty,

I am writing to ask that you oppose Amendment 1 to CR35-2016 (the Bicycle Master Plan) that would remove a pathway along the Little Patuxent River adjacent to the Allview community planned for Phase II of Capital Project T7107.

The original proposed path adjacent to Allview would give residents of Allview like me access to the Howard County pathway network that is currently not available. This would help improve our neighborhood as a healthy, connected and livable community in Howard County.

A pathway adjacent to Allview would provide many benefits. It would:

- encourage healthier lifestyles
- provide easier biking and walking access to downtown Columbia and other pathways
- reduce negative consequences of motorized transportation: air pollution, carbon emissions, motor vehicle accidents, congestion, etc.

A number of survey research studies have found that a substantial majority of residents living near pathways believe that pathways improve their quality of life.

Published research using hedonic pricing (cited below) has shown that, controlling for other factors, proximity to pathways has a positive and statistically significant impact on property values on the order of 2% to 5% and ranging as high as a 20% increase in value. For Allview, even a 2.5% increase would translate to a positive impact of approximately \$10,000 per household. This would be accompanied by a corresponding increase in the property tax base for Howard County. Common concerns about potential negative impacts of pathways are not typically borne out by sound economic research.

In conclusion, I sincerely hope that you will support the original plan and oppose Amendment 1 that will remove the planned pathway adjacent to Allview.

Sincerely yours,

Lars Olson

9942 Ferndale Drive

Columbia, Md 21046

S. Nicholls and J.L. Crompton. The impact of greenways on property values: evidence from Austin, Texas, *Journal of Leisure Research*. 2005, v. 37, pp. 321-341.

D.P. Racca and A. Dhanju. Property value/desirability effects of bike paths adjacent to residential areas. Report

prepared for Delaware Center For Transportation and The State of Delaware Department of Transportation, Nov. 2006.

P.K. Asabere and F.E. Huffman. The relative impacts of trails and greenbelts on home price. *Journal of Real Estate Financial Economics*, 2009, v. 38, pp. 408-419.

O. Parent and R. vom Hofe. Understanding the impact of trails on residential property values in the presence of spatial dependence. *Annals of Regional Science*. 2013. v. 51, pp. 355-375.

FW: CR 35 and Complete Streets Amendment

Sigaty, Mary Kay

Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 10:30 AM

To: Sayers, Margery

Cc: CouncilRecords

Attachments: Copy of Complete Streets ~1.xlsx (13 KB) ; Toole Memo_Need for CS Des~1.pdf (437 KB) ; CR35 Bike Master Plan and ~1.pdf (238 KB)

From: Nikki Highsmith Vernick [mailto:nhighsmith_vernick@thehorizonfoundation.org]

Sent: Monday, March 28, 2016 10:39 AM

To: Sigaty, Mary Kay

Cc: Glenn Schneider

Subject: FW: CR 35 and Complete Streets Amendment

Mary Kay,

Just covering all my bases and sending to your email as well. I will call you to see if you have questions.

Best,

Nikki

Nikki HighsmithVernick
President and CEO

The Horizon Foundation

10480 Little Patuxent Parkway

Suite 900

Columbia, MD 21044

410-715-0311 office

443-718-8100 cell

nhighsmith_vernick@thehorizonfoundation.org

From: Nikki Highsmith Vernick

Sent: Monday, March 28, 2016 10:27 AM

To: 'councilmail@howardcountymd.gov'

Cc: Ball, Calvin B; Glenn Schneider; ian.kennedy7@gmail.com

Subject: CR 35 and Complete Streets Amendment

Dear Howard County Councilmembers:

The Horizon Foundation was very excited to see the tremendous turnout for CR-35 -the Bike Master Plan and Complete Streets Statement. Particularly the bike master plan is a culmination of years of hard work and we applaud everyone who has been involved.

We understand that Council Chairman Calvin Ball will be introducing an amendment to CR-35 after talking with each of you. The amendment is related to Complete Streets and is supported by the Horizon Foundation. The amendment would accomplish several items:

- (1) Ask the Complete Streets Implementation Team to draft a comprehensive Complete Streets policy that

is consistent with national best practices. The statement of intent related to Complete Streets included in the accompanying letter to the Bike Master Plan is a visionary first step, but it is *NOT* a comprehensive Complete Streets policy. The attached Complete Streets Score Card includes 10 elements of a Complete Streets policy that meets national best practices. We hope that Howard County could further develop its Complete Streets policy to meet all 10 elements.

- (2) Direct the Complete Streets Implementation Team to develop a Complete Streets Design Manual that could stand alone and represent overarching design specifications for the County. A stand-alone Complete Streets Design Manual reconciles differences between multiple guidelines and therefore would serve as a one-stop-shop that reduces the need for developers to apply for variances to build high quality pedestrian and bicycle projects. Howard County would not be unique in adopting this approach. Cities like Alexandria, VA; Charlotte, NC; New Haven CT; Dallas, TX and others have also created new design manuals. For more information, please see the attached memo from the nationally recognized design firm, Toole Design Group. The memo outlines justifications for having a separate, stand along Design Manual and lists many cities and localities around the country that have done so.
- (3) Finally, to ensure lasting, meaningful change that will benefit our community for decades to come, the amendment would also have the Complete Streets Policy and the Complete Streets Design Manual submitted to the Council for final approval.

I hope you can support this amendment. If you have any questions for Horizon or Toole Design Group, please let us know.

Best,

Nikki Highsmith Vernick

Nikki HighsmithVernick
President and CEO

The Horizon Foundation
10480 Little Patuxent Parkway
Suite 900
Columbia, MD 21044
410-715-0311 office
443-718-8100 cell
nhighsmith_vernick@thehorizonfoundation.org

Elements of Complete Streets

Policy

The following 10 elements are nationally recognized as the most important components in a Complete Streets policy. Policy Elements were developed by the

Element	Description	Grading Criteria	Value	Score
Sets a vision	The policy establishes a motivating vision for why the community wants Complete Streets: to improve safety, promote better health, increase efficiency, improve the convenience of choices, or for other reasons.	Indirect: Indirect statement ("shall implement Complete Streets principles," etc.)	weak	1
		Average: Direct statement with equivocating or weaker language ("consider," "may")	medium	3
		Direct: Direct statement of accommodation ("must," "shall," "will")	strong	5
All Users and Modes	The policy specifies that "all modes" includes walking, bicycling, riding public transportation, driving trucks, buses and automobiles and "all users" includes people of all ages and abilities.	"Bicyclists and pedestrians"	required	req
		"Bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit"	good	1
		"Bicyclists, pedestrians, transit," plus one more mode	better	2
		"Bicycles, pedestrians, transit," plus two more modes	better	3
		Additional point for including reference to "users of all ages"	better	1
		Additional point for including reference to "users of all abilities"	better	1
All projects and phases	Applies to both new and retrofit projects, including design, planning, maintenance, and operations, for the entire right of way.	Applies to new construction only	weak	0
		Applies to new and retrofit/reconstruction projects	strong	3
		Additional points if the policy clearly applies to all projects, or specifically includes repair/3R projects, maintenance, and/or operations	better	2
Exceptions	Any exceptions to the policy are specified and approved by a high-level official.	No mention	weak	0
		Lists exceptions, but at least one lacks clarity or allows loose interpretation	weak	1
		Lists exceptions, none are inappropriate	medium	2
		Additional points for specifying an approval process	strong	3
Creates a network	The policy recognizes the need to create a comprehensive, integrated and connected network for all	No mention	weak	0
		Acknowledge	strong	5

Jurisdiction: All agencies and all roads	All other agencies that govern transportation activities can clearly understand the policy's application and may be involved in the process as appropriate.	Agency-owned	assumed	--
		States and regions: agency-funded, but not agency-owned	strong	3
		Counties and cities: privately-built roads	strong	3
		Additional points for recognizing the need to work with other agencies, departments, or jurisdictions	better	2
Design criteria	Directs the use of the latest and best design criteria and guidelines, while recognizing the need for flexibility in balancing user needs.	No mention	weak	0
		References specific design criteria or directing use of the best and latest	strong	3
		References design flexibility in the balance of user needs	medium	2
Context-sensitive	The current and planned context (buildings, land use, and transportation needs) is considered when planning	No mention	weak	0
		Acknowledge	strong	5
Performance measures	The policy includes performance standards with measurable outcomes.	Not mentioned and not one of next steps	weak	0
		Establishes new measures (does not count in implementation points)	strong	5
Implementation	Includes specific next steps for implementation of the policy.	No implementation plan specified	weak	0
		Addresses implementation in general	medium	1
		Addresses two to four implementation steps	strong	3
		Additional point for assigning oversight of implementation to a person or advisory board or for establishing a reporting requirement	better	1
		Additional point for directing changes to project selection criteria	better	1



TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

Date: March 25, 2016

To: Nikki Highsmith Vernick and Glenn Schneider

Organization: The Horizon Foundation

From: Heather Deutsch and Carol Kachadoorian, Toole Design Group

Project: Healthy Lifestyles – Complete Streets for Howard County

Re: Research request – why creating a comprehensive complete streets design manual is considered a best practice and the most effective way to implement a complete streets policy

Communities across the U.S. are transforming their transportation infrastructure to safely accommodate all modes of travel by implementing complete streets policies. The policy prescribes actions to improve the built environment including revising transportation design guidelines for example through the establishment of a complete streets design manual.

Complete streets design manuals reconcile differences between multiple guidelines (i.e. small area plans, roadway design manuals, standard details, stormwater design). They serve as a one stop shop that reduces the need for developers to apply for variances to build high quality pedestrian and bicycle projects.

Developing a complete streets design manual is considered a best practice for implementing consistent design across all modes of travel for a number of reasons as outlined below.

Complete Streets Design Manuals...

- **Re-emphasize a community's transportation vision.** With the adoption of a Complete Streets policy, it is important to develop complete streets design guidelines that re-emphasize the community's shift in transportation planning and design. Similar to a comprehensive plan with its accompanying zoning map, a complete streets design manual reiterates a complete streets policy.
 - *Tacoma, WA: Tacoma began by adopting a complete streets policy which was then incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. Design guidelines were developed for mixed-use centers. Interest grew in developing guidelines for other roadway types until it became clear that the City would be best served by a comprehensive citywide set of design guidelines—creating a comprehensive design manual—which is currently under development.*

- **Rebalance the emphasis from moving cars to moving people.** Complete streets design manuals place less emphasis on high speed designs and more emphasis on the pedestrian and bicycle realm. They address issues such as minimum lane widths, design speeds, corner radii—all to produce slower speeds in areas where pedestrians and bicyclists are expected. They also provide design guidance on incorporating pedestrian and bicyclists travel along and across streets that may not typically have included such facilities. Complete streets design manuals include cross-sections based on context that include facilities for all users.
 - *Tacoma, WA: Different types of streets serve different needs, users and destinations, and should be designed accordingly. The City's Complete Streets Guidelines will include a range of street typologies tailored to the goals, functions and typical conditions found in different areas of the City.*
- **Break the silos that exist between agencies.** Traditional design and engineering manuals are often developed by and for traffic engineers. Other modes of transportation, Safe Routes to School and Vision Zero programs, streetscapes, and stormwater management are often addressed in separate documents or sub-chapters. A complete streets design manual brings all agencies together to develop guidelines that comprehensively address the entire right-of-way and public realm.
 - *Charlotte, NC: Charlotte's Urban Street Design Guidelines includes not only the planning and design of Charlotte's streets to create more travel choices, but addresses livability and economic development objectives.*
 - *Alexandria, VA: Alexandria's Complete Streets Design Guide was a collaborative effort between various City agencies, including Planning & Zoning, Transportation & Environmental Services, Fire, and others. The Design Guide was seen as an avenue for various City priorities to be addressed, including livability, stormwater management, and others.*
- **Focus on the process as much as the product.** A manual is only as functional as the staff that is informed about it, understands how to use it, and is committed to following it. Complete streets design manuals incorporate all agencies and the public in their development. This leads to a product that is well-understood and followed by all agencies.
 - *Boston, MA: Boston's Complete Streets Guide was developed with staff from across a variety of agencies including planning, design, construction and maintenance.*
- **Educate and involve the public.** Many traditional design and engineering manuals are not developed publically and follow roadway design guidelines rather than recognizing community context. Their language is often undecipherable by the public leaving communities unhappy with their transportation networks yet unable to understand the principles behind their design. Complete streets design manuals are organized and include graphics accessible to the public.
 - *Monterey, CA: The Monterey Bay Area Complete Streets Guidebook includes a vision, performance measures, street cross-sections as well as a chapter outlining 'transitions to complete streets'. The document is easy to navigate with clear graphics.*

- **Recognize the flexibility inherent in traditional traffic engineering guidelines and design interconnected systems together.** Roadway safety guidelines have been developed over the years and are often adopted as standards even in contexts where they may lead to unsafe conditions. Complete streets design manuals recognize that traditional roadway guidelines offer flexibility in interpretation and that context, such as proximity to schools, shopping districts, and parks, must be recognized to improve safety. In addition, right-of-way elements should be designed together— for example, crosswalks curb ramps and push buttons or sidewalks, street trees and stormwater management—to ensure a functional complete street.
 - *Las Vegas, NV: Their Complete Streets Design Guidelines note legal standings in relation to adopted national standards such as “The Green Book encourages flexibility in design within certain parameters, as evidenced by the AASHTO publication A Guide to Achieving Flexibility in Highway Design. For example, 10-foot lanes, which agencies often shun out of concerns of deviating from standards, are well within AASHTO guidelines.”*
- **Reconsider the traditional functional classification system for roadways (arterial, collector, local) to be more responsive to the adjacent land use and future plans for more walkable and bikeable communities.** Many design manuals direct decisions to be made on the basis of current and future vehicular roadways capacity, expansion and repair. Complete street design manuals establish new procedures that create safe and comfortable outcomes for current and future users of all modes through the establishment of street typologies.
 - *Charlotte, NC: Charlotte established a six-step process as part of their Urban Street Design Guidelines on which transportation improvement decisions are based.*
 1. *Define the existing and future land use and urban design context.*
 2. *Define the existing and future transportation context.*
 3. *Identify deficiencies.*
 4. *Describe future objectives.*
 5. *Recommend street classification and test initial cross-section.*
 6. *Describe trade-offs and select cross-section.*

Howard County would not be unique in adopting this approach. Example communities that created new design manuals related to their enactment of Complete Streets Policies include:

- Alexandria, VA: <https://www.alexandriava.gov/CompleteStreets> - currently under development
- Charlottesville, VA: currently under review by City Planning Department.
- Charlotte, NC: <http://charmeck.org/city/charlotte/Transportation/PlansProjects/pages/urban%20street%20design%20guidelines.aspx>
- New Haven, CT: <http://www.cityofnewhaven.com/Engineering/pdfs/CS-Manual-FINAL.pdf>
- Las Vegas, NV: (Regional Transportation Commission for Las Vegas): <http://www.rtcnv.com/planning-engineering/rtc-projects/complete-streets/>
- Dallas, TX: http://dallascityhall.com/departments/sustainabledevelopment/DCH%20Documents/pdf/DCS-Design-Manual_DRAFT_091713.pdf

- Boston, MA: <http://bostoncompletestreets.org/>
- Monterey Bay, CA: <http://www.sanbenitocog.org/files/final-2013-complete-streets-guidebook.pdf>
- Tacoma, WA: www.cityoftacoma.org/government/city_departments/planning_and_development_services/planning_services/complete_street_design_guidelines_project - current under development

If you have any additional questions, please do not hesitate to let us know.



BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Glenn M. Falcao
Chair

Nikki Highsmith Vernick
President & CEO

Henry E. Posko, Jr.
Vice Chair

Janet S. Currie
Treasurer

Felicita Solá-Carter
Secretary

Lawrence J. Appel

Michael S. Barr

Lynn C. Coleman

Steven A. Gershman

Paul M. Gleichauf

Stacie Hunt

Jeanne A. Kennedy

Tracy Miller

Gregory O. Olaniran

Yvette Oquendo

Robin Steele

Ned Tillman

Kwang Chul "KC" Whang

Dou Alvin Zhang

Resolution No:

CR 35-2016

Title:

A Resolution Approving a Bicycle Master Plan and a Complete Streets Policy

Position:

SUPPORT WITH AMENDMENT

The Horizon Foundation is dedicated to improving health and wellness in Howard County, and it strongly believes that our county has a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to lay the groundwork for a future Howard County that is designed and built to support the long-term health and well-being of those who live or work here. For that reason, the Foundation supports CR 35-2016 with amendment.

How we plan, build, operate, and maintain our streets shapes how our community functions. A comprehensive complete streets approach creates a sense of community that is accessible, sustainable, healthy, connected, and economically thriving.

The Foundation commends the County Executive and his team for championing a complete streets planning approach that is sorely needed in our County and administering the community process that led to the Bike Master Plan before you. However, the Foundation urges that the County Council strengthen CR 35-2016 to ensure that the complete streets planning process effectively leads to lasting, meaningful changes that will benefit our community for decades to come. To that end, the Foundation suggests an amendment to CR 35-2016 (see attached).

The Foundation and its many community partners hope that Howard County's complete streets policy and the design manual accompanying it will become the gold standard for the nation. This is a key moment in our county's evolution and another opportunity for you to demonstrate a true commitment to our community's health and quality of life. Please vote to approve CR 35-2016 with our proposed amendment.

Thank you for your consideration of this testimony.

AMENDMENT #1 to CR 35-2016

(This amendment would modify the charge of the Complete Streets Implementation Team to include drafting of a comprehensive Complete Streets Policy/Design Manual and request that both be submitted to the Council for approval.)

Strike lines 27-31 on page 1 and strike lines 1-3 on page 2. Substitute the following:

WHEREAS, THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE IS ORGANIZING A WORKING GROUP, THE COMPLETE STREETS IMPLEMENTATION TEAM, THAT WILL (1) DRAFT A COMPREHENSIVE COMPLETE STREETS POLICY CONSISTENT WITH BEST PRACTICES; AND (2) DEVELOP A COMPLETE STREETS DESIGN MANUAL (THE "DESIGN MANUAL") THAT IMPLEMENTS THE COMPLETE STREETS POLICY AND INCORPORATES NECESSARY ELEMENTS FROM THE CURRENT HOWARD COUNTY DESIGN MANUAL, VOLUME III, ROADS AND BRIDGES; AND

WHEREAS, UPON COMPLETION OF THE COMPLETE STREETS IMPLEMENTATION TEAM'S WORK, THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE WILL SUBMIT TO THE COUNTY COUNCIL BOTH THE COMPREHENSIVE COMPLETE STREETS POLICY AND DESIGN MANUAL FOR FINAL APPROVAL; AND

FW: Letter of Support- Bicycle Master Plan

Sigaty, Mary Kay

Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 10:30 AM
To: Sayers, Margery
Cc: CouncilRecords
Attachments: Letter of Support.pdf (231 KB)

From: Ainsley, John
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2016 9:10 AM
To: Sigaty, Mary Kay
Cc: Clay, Mary; Graham, Clive
Subject: Letter of Support- Bicycle Master Plan

Mary Kay Sigaty, County Council member,

Please see attached letter from Ron Hartman, Chairperson for the Public Transportation Board in support of the Bicycle Master Plan (Council Resolution 35-2016).

Sincerely,

John Ainsley
Office of Transportation | Department of County Administration
(410) 313-3054 (410) 313-1655 (fax)
jainsley@howardcountymd.gov





HOWARD COUNTY PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION BOARD

3430 Court House Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043 ■ 410-313-2350

Ron Hartman, Chair
Jason Quan, Vice Chair

www.howardcountymd.gov
FAX 410-313-3467
TDD 410-313-2323

March 24, 2016

Calvin B. Ball, Ed.D, Chairperson, County Council
George Howard Building
3430 Court House Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043

Re: Support of Howard County's Bicycle Master Plan - Council Resolution 35-2016

Dear Dr. Ball,

On March 22, 2016, the Public Transportation Board was given a presentation of the Howard County Bicycle Master Plan (also known as BikeHoward) at its monthly board meeting. Mr. Chris Eatough of the Office of Transportation presented the plan, which is currently being reviewed by the County Council and being considered for approval.

The Howard County Public Transportation Board (PTB) emphatically and unanimously supports the Bicycle Master Plan and urges the County Council to approve Council Resolution 35-2016. This is an important step forward for Howard County and provides the vision and framework to make biking a safe, convenient transportation option for many people in Howard County.

The PTB also opposes Amendment 1, to remove a proposed pathway segment located on Columbia Association property adjacent to the Allview community. This pathway would provide a direct, car-free connection between Downtown Columbia and the Savage/Laurel area, including access to the MARC train stations. Furthermore, all projects in the Bicycle Master Plan are labeled as preliminary/proposed, so there is no need to eliminate individual projects from consideration at this time. More study and public input can determine whether this is the best option for providing this connection, but this potentially valuable project should not be taken off the table.

The PTB also supports an accelerated Bicycle Master Plan. Short term projects are considered 0-10 years, but with funding support and coordination, most of these projects could be implemented in less than 10 years. Also, some of the mid and long term projects could be implemented in the short term.

On behalf of the Howard County Public Transportation Board, I urge you to approve County Council Resolution 35-2016 adopting a Complete Streets policy and the Howard County Bicycle Master Plan in its entirety, without removing individual projects.

Sincerely,

Ron Hartman, Chair

Cc: Jon Weinstein, Vice Chairperson, County Council, Jen Terrasa, County Council, Mary Kay Sigaty, County Council, Greg Fox, County Council
Allan Kittleman, Howard County Executive
Lonnie Robbins, Chief Administrative Officer

6735 Allview Drive
Columbia, MD 21046
March 27, 2015

Dear Council Member Sigaty,

I write concerning the proposed amendment to remove Phase II of T7107 from the Master Bicycle Plan. At the public hearing on March 21, I testified on behalf of Allview residents who would like to see this pathway built. At that time I had not fully grasped the fact that there was a threat to this path (first revealed to me in a March 18 forward of an email sent to Larry Schoen on March 17). I have not heard of any recent community outreach specifically related to this path and question whether there has been any attempt in the past year to assess views from the community. Since learning of the proposed amendment, I and a handful of neighbors have started gathering indications of support for the path. We are trying to reach out to as many as possible of the 540+ households in the Allview Area Community with a petition. Given the short time window before the vote, it will be difficult to gather many signatures, but we firmly believe there is enough support here to overrule a decision to remove this path from the Bicycle Master Plan at this time.

Never having seen the petition Mr. Markle frequently mentions on which he claims to have signatures of 160 Allview residents opposed to the path, and not being aware of any more recent survey I assume this petition is the same one brandished at a community meeting in March 2013. While I am sympathetic to the objections of some neighbors that having a route near their property could intrude upon their view and privacy, I do not share their fears of more litter, noise, parking problems and crime intruding into the neighborhood. Having ridden most of Columbia pathways for many years, I have seen very little evidence of these problems. Other pathway abutters have expressed hope that they could share this land with others who love the great outdoors.

Mr. Markle and Mr Compson also mention their concern that cyclists and walkers will be swept away by flash floods if this path is built. Since March 2013, they have continued to submit undated photos of a flooded swing set . The fact that the trees in the photos are in full leaf strongly suggest that they must have been taken during or before 2012. I am not aware of any such serious floods in recent years. Most of the property in those photos is owned by Mr. Markle and his neighbor and can be clearly viewed from the bridge that crosses the river on Stevens Forest Rd. A current view from the bridge shows that this carefully manicured property has certainly sustained no serious flooding recently. Data from a river monitor along the route of the path shows that, although the river has gone into the adjacent flood plain an average of 2-3 times a year for the past five years, the flow on these occasions tends to be shallow and of low velocity (<https://bikehoward.files.wordpress.com/2014/12/section-2-existing-conditions-patuxent-branch-trail-extension-feasibility-study-final.pdf>) I and others are more concerned with the daily risks associated with riding and walking on our often steep, winding, roads, while dodging parked cars and traffic. Although I am happy to see increasing numbers of families walking or cycling in the community, Allview is a tough neighborhood in which to learn and practice riding a bicycle. The lack of sidewalks and connection to Columbia pathways leaves little choice other than to put bikes in cars and drive to a safer area. Experienced cyclists and commuters, walkers, runners, dog owners and bird watchers would also find a path by the river to be safer and more pleasant than negotiating our roads. For these reasons I expect that the number of residents in favor of the path may now well outnumber the number opposed.

In summary, I strongly feel that a decision to remove Phase II of T7107 from the Bicycle Master Plan is premature at best and urge you to work to defeat this unfortunate amendment.

Very respectfully,
Sally Ryder

FW: Follow-Up From Bike Lane Testimony

Sigaty, Mary Kay

Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 10:31 AM**To:** CouncilRecords; Sayers, Margery**Attachments:** 21-1209 Three Foot Rule.pdf (104 KB) ; 21-1205 Riding Abreast.pdf (96 KB) ; H.B. 214 (Passing Bicycles).pdf (76 KB)

From: Kim Egan Rutter [mailto:egankk@me.com]**Sent:** Tuesday, March 22, 2016 11:21 AM**To:** Sigaty, Mary Kay**Subject:** FW: Follow-Up From Bike Lane Testimony

Council Member Sigaty,

I had the wrong email address for you in the email below.

My apologies.

Kim Rutter

From: Kim Rutter <egankk@me.com>**Date:** Tuesday, March 22, 2016 11:18 AM**To:** <JTerrasa@HowardCountyMD.gov>**Cc:** <cball@howardcountymd.gov>, <gfox@howardcountymd.gov>, Jon Weinstein

<JWeinstein@HowardCountyMD.gov>, <msigaty@howardcountymd.gov>

Subject: Follow-Up From Bike Lane Testimony

Council Member Terrasa,

I am taking the liberty of sending some source materials for you regarding the bicycle safety rules for narrow roads that I addressed last night at the Bike Plan hearing.

Three-Foot Rule

The 3-foot rule and its exceptions is at Maryland Code Ann. sec. 21-1209(a)(2)(ii)-(iii), which reads, in relevant part: "The driver of a motor vehicle shall, . . .when overtaking a bicycle, . . . pass safely at a distance of not less than 3 feet, unless, at the time . . . (iii) the highway on which the vehicle is being driven is not wide enough to lawfully pass the bicycle . . . at a distance of at least 3 feet." I have attached the provision here.

The cycling community has been trying, unsuccessfully, to eliminate the 3-foot rule for some time. See information at <https://www.bikemaryland.org/three-feet-on-every-road/>. As it happens, just yesterday a bill to modify the exception received its first reading in the Senate Judicial Proceedings committee. That bill modifies but does not eliminate the provision, however, and leaves the exception for situations where the bicyclist is not riding to the right or riding on the shoulder, when shoulders exist.

It is quite common on our roads for the cyclists to ride in the middle of the lane instead of the right because the shoulders (where they exist) and the right edges of the lanes are chip and tarred and so full of millings and storm water debris. In places the shoulders are essentially impassable and the cyclists have no other options. In those situations, the exception to the 3-foot rule would still apply, even if the pending bill becomes law.

Riding Two Abreast

The section prohibiting riding abreast when it impedes traffic is at sec. 12-1205(b). It reads: "Each person operating a bicycle or a motor scooter on a roadway may ride two abreast only if the flow of traffic is unimpeded." I have attached it here as well.

It bears noting that the Maryland laws on bicycles in the roads are difficult to follow. I have practiced regulatory law for almost 20 years and was a civil litigator for 15 years, and it took me some not insignificant amount of time to construct a complete picture of what is allowed where, under what circumstances, and what would be allowed were the various pending bill to pass. The chances that County residents and local bike groups will understand the law without assistance is not high. It may be that educational campaigns that convert the bicycle statutes into plain English for Howard County residents is necessary, regardless of the status of the Bike Howard Plan.

Please let me know if I can help in any other way with these materials.

Best,

Kim Rutter

The Salt Box
3435 Jennings Chapel Road
Woodbine, Maryland 21797

e: egankk@me.com | p: 443-931-7662

Statute Text

Article - Transportation

§21-1209.

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the driver of a vehicle shall:

(1) Exercise due care to avoid colliding with any bicycle, EPAMD, or motor scooter being ridden by a person; and

(2) When overtaking a bicycle, an EPAMD, or a motor scooter, pass safely at a distance of not less than 3 feet, unless, at the time:

(i) The bicycle, EPAMD, or motor scooter rider fails to operate the vehicle in conformance with § 21-1205(a) of this subtitle ("Riding to right side of roadway") or § 21-1205.1(b) of this subtitle ("Roadway with bike lane or shoulder paved to smooth surface");

(ii) A passing clearance of less than 3 feet is caused solely by the bicycle, EPAMD, or motor scooter rider failing to maintain a steady course; or

(iii) The highway on which the vehicle is being driven is not wide enough to lawfully pass the bicycle, EPAMD, or motor scooter at a distance of at least 3 feet.

(b) A person may not throw any object at or in the direction of any person riding a bicycle, an EPAMD, or a motor scooter.

(c) A person may not open the door of any motor vehicle with intent to strike, injure, or interfere with any person riding a bicycle, an EPAMD, or a motor scooter.

(d) Unless otherwise specified in this title, the driver of a vehicle shall yield the right-of-way to a person who is lawfully riding a bicycle, an EPAMD, or a motor scooter in a designated bike lane or shoulder if the driver of the vehicle is about to enter or cross the designated bike lane or shoulder.

Article - Transportation

§21-1205.

(a) Each person operating a bicycle or a motor scooter at a speed less than the speed of traffic at the time and place and under the conditions then existing on a roadway shall ride as near to the right side of the roadway as practicable and safe, except when:

- (1) Making or attempting to make a left turn;
- (2) Operating on a one-way street;
- (3) Passing a stopped or slower moving vehicle;
- (4) Avoiding pedestrians or road hazards;
- (5) The right lane is a right turn only lane; or
- (6) Operating in a lane that is too narrow for a bicycle or motor scooter and another vehicle to travel safely side by side within the lane.

(b) Each person operating a bicycle or a motor scooter on a roadway may ride two abreast only if the flow of traffic is unimpeded.

(c) Each person operating a bicycle or a motor scooter on a roadway shall exercise due care when passing a vehicle.

(d) Each person operating a bicycle or a motor scooter on a roadway may walk the bicycle or motor scooter on the right side of a highway if there is no sidewalk.

HOUSE BILL 214

R5

6lr0549
CF SB 1123

By: Delegates Lafferty, Fraser-Hidalgo, Lam, Carr, Chang, Ebersole, Krimm,
Lierman, Miele, and Moon

Introduced and read first time: January 22, 2016

Assigned to: Environment and Transportation

Committee Report: Favorable with amendments

House action: Adopted

Read second time: March 14, 2016

CHAPTER _____

AN ACT concerning

Vehicle Laws – Passing Bicycles, Personal Mobility Devices, or Motor Scooters

FOR the purpose of ~~repealing a certain exception to a certain requirement that a driver overtake and pass a bicycle, an electric personal assistive mobility device (EPAMD), or a motor scooter in a certain manner that applies when a highway lacks sufficient width,~~ requiring a driver ~~who~~ of a motor vehicle that passes a bicycle, an EPAMD, or a motor scooter in a certain manner in accordance with a certain provision of law to ~~pass at~~ slow to a reasonable or prudent speed that is safe for existing weather, road, and vehicular or pedestrian traffic conditions; prohibiting a driver ~~who~~ of a motor vehicle that passes a bicycle, an EPAMD, or a motor scooter in a certain manner in accordance with a certain provision of law from endangering, impeding, or interfering with the bicycle, EPAMD, or motor scooter, or any other traffic using the highway; making a technical correction; and generally relating to rules of the road for overtaking and passing bicycles, EPAMDs, and motor scooters.

BY repealing and reenacting, with amendments,
Article – Transportation
Section 21-1209
Annotated Code of Maryland
(2012 Replacement Volume and 2015 Supplement)

SECTION 1. BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF MARYLAND,
That the Laws of Maryland read as follows:

EXPLANATION: CAPITALS INDICATE MATTER ADDED TO EXISTING LAW.

[Brackets] indicate matter deleted from existing law.

Underlining indicates amendments to bill.

~~Strike out~~ indicates matter stricken from the bill by amendment or deleted from the law by amendment.



Article – Transportation

21-1209.

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the driver of a vehicle shall:

(1) Exercise due care to avoid colliding with any bicycle, EPAMD, or motor scooter being ridden by a person; and

(2) **(i)** When overtaking a bicycle, an EPAMD, or a motor scooter, pass safely at a distance of not less than 3 feet, unless, at the time:

[(i)] 1. The bicycle, EPAMD, or motor scooter rider fails to operate the vehicle in conformance with § 21-1205(a) of this subtitle (“Riding to right side of roadway”) or § 21-1205.1(b) of this subtitle (“Roadway with bike lane [or shoulder] paved to smooth surface”); **OR**

[(ii)] 2. A passing clearance of less than 3 feet is caused solely by the bicycle, EPAMD, or motor scooter rider failing to maintain a steady course~~;~~ or

~~**[(iii)]**~~ **3.** The highway on which the vehicle is being driven is not wide enough to lawfully pass the bicycle, EPAMD, or motor scooter at a distance of at least 3 feet~~;~~.

(ii) ~~A PERSON WHO~~ THE DRIVER OF A MOTOR VEHICLE THAT PASSES A BICYCLE, AN EPAMD, OR A MOTOR SCOOTER AT A DISTANCE OF LESS THAN 3 FEET IN ACCORDANCE WITH SUBPARAGRAPH (i) OF THIS PARAGRAPH:

1. ~~SHALL PASS AT SLOW TO~~ A REASONABLE AND PRUDENT SPEED THAT IS SAFE FOR EXISTING WEATHER, ROAD, AND VEHICULAR OR PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC CONDITIONS; AND

2. MAY NOT ENDANGER, IMPEDE, OR INTERFERE WITH THE BICYCLE, EPAMD, OR MOTOR SCOOTER, OR ANY OTHER TRAFFIC USING THE HIGHWAY.

(b) A person may not throw any object at or in the direction of any person riding a bicycle, an EPAMD, or a motor scooter.

(c) A person may not open the door of any motor vehicle with intent to strike, injure, or interfere with any person riding a bicycle, an EPAMD, or a motor scooter.

(d) Unless otherwise specified in this title, the driver of a vehicle shall yield the right-of-way to a person who is lawfully riding a bicycle, an EPAMD, or a motor scooter in a designated bike lane or shoulder if the driver of the vehicle is about to enter or cross the designated bike lane or shoulder.

SECTION 2. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That this Act shall take effect June 1, 2016.

Approved:

Governor.

Speaker of the House of Delegates.

President of the Senate.

FW: CORRECTION - Fwd: Legislative Public Hearing on Monday March 21st including Bike Master Plan (CR35-2016)

Sigaty, Mary Kay

Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 10:32 AM

To: CouncilRecords; Sayers, Margery

From: Larry Schoen [mailto:larryschoen@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, March 18, 2016 11:52 AM

To: Ainsley, John; Graham, Clive; Nichols, Philip; Sigaty, Mary Kay; Clay, Mary

Cc: Earl Armiger; Ron Hartman; Jason Quan; Astamay Curtis; Hector Garcia; Alice Giles; Mark Pritchard; Andrew Johnson (andrewj@transitrrta.com); Victor Jimenez (victorj@transitrrta.com); Sharonlee Vogel

Subject: Re: CORRECTION - Fwd: Legislative Public Hearing on Monday March 21st including Bike Master Plan (CR35-2016)

I've been informed that Exec. Kittleman decided to do this in a public manner, with a separate amendment the council will hear and on which the public will be able to comment. I support this public process, even though I still disagree with the underlying effort to delete a public amenity that has great merit. I also believe it sets a bad precedent to focus on individual projects at this time rather than the overall plan.

Larry

On Mar 18, 2016, at 10:15 AM, Larry Schoen <larryschoen@gmail.com> wrote:

Ladies and Gentlemen, please discourage the County Exec. from making changes to the Bike master plan at this late date and in such a back door way. Those who support or oppose individual projects will have a public forum in which to make their views known.

Regarding the merits of the particular project Councilwoman Terasa opposes, there are a few noisy constituents who oppose a trail on the CA Land land bordering their property.

However, I know lots of folks, especially in Allview, who support the trail and are just not as vocal. CA Land is there for us all to enjoy, and those who own property near it do not have exclusive rights to it.

We just need the courage to tell constituents that they don't own the CA Land next to their property.

Larry

Begin forwarded message:

From: Larry Schoen <LarrySchoen@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Legislative Public Hearing on Monday March 21st including Bike Master Plan (CR35-2016)

Date: March 18, 2016 at 10:05:26 AM EDT

To: "Terrasa, Jen" <jterrasa@howardcountymd.gov>

Jen, I know there are a few noisy constituents who oppose a trail on the park land bordering their property. However, I know lots of folks, especially in Allview, who support the trail and are just not as vocal. I've asked a few I know to contact you.

I have observed a lot of community support for this, even though a few people who border parkland don't want a facility that will allow others to enjoy it. Parks are there for us all to enjoy, and those who own property near a park do not have exclusive rights to it.

Please have the courage to tell your constituents that they don't own the park next to their property.

Larry

On Mar 17, 2016, at 11:18 PM, Terrasa, Jen <jterrasa@howardcountymd.gov> wrote:

Good evening,

Because you have contacted me in the past about Capital Project T7107 (Patuxent Branch Trail Extension), I want to call your attention to the County Executive's proposed Bike Master Plan which is pending before the County Council as [CR35-2016](#).

Please note that as proposed, the plan includes Phase I of T7107 which runs along the Little Patuxent River under US29 and Broken Land Parkway (BLP) and includes the development of bike lanes on Stevens Forest Road south of BLP as one of its short term/structured projects.

While Phase II of T7107 is listed as a medium term project (see Maps 3, 6, and 7 on page 26 and 29-30 of the plan), I think it is important for the plan to help focus County resources on key connections where there is a lot of community support for the project. And, because many of you have contacted me with your concerns about this portion of T7107, I think it is best to remove references to this part of the route, and I am working with the County Executive to amend the plan to reflect this. If this is important to you, my colleagues need to hear from you.

Please see below for additional information regarding the proposed Bike Master Plan and for ways to share your input.

All the best,

Jen

Jennifer Terrasa
Councilwoman, District 3
Howard County Council
(410) 313-2001 jterrasa@howardcountymd.gov
"Like" my page on [Facebook](#) and follow me on [Twitter](#)!

From: Terrasa, Jen
Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2016 9:20 PM
To: Terrasa, Jen
Subject: Legislative Public Hearing on Monday March 21st including Bike Master Plan (CR35-2016)

Good evening,

Last week the County Executive filed the proposed Bike Master Plan for Council approval as [CR35-2016](#). A hearing on the plan will be held Monday, March 21, 2016 at 7:00 pm in the Banneker Room at the George Howard Building, 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, MD 21043. A vote is expected on April 4, 2016.

As many of you know, the development of a Howard County Bicycle Master Plan began more than 2 1/2 years ago when the County contracted with Toole Design to develop general recommendations as well as a plan for short, medium, and long term projects to help Howard County become a truly bike friendly community, and to support the use of bicycles as an alternative means of transportation. This process was overseen by the Office of Transportation, which held multiple community meetings with bike advocates throughout the process.

As bike/ped advocate for many years, I am pleased to see a plan moving forward. I'm excited about the prospect of becoming a more bike friendly community, and of expanding opportunities for bikes to become a viable alternate means of transportation. I also think it is important for the plan to help focus County resources on key connections where there is a lot of community support for the project. I am very interested in having you share your input.

If you are interested in bike connections, or want to see where these paths will be located in your neighborhood, the entire proposed Bike Master Plan is included with [CR35-2016](#). Other information about the Bike Master Plan can be found at <http://bikehoward.com/>. You may want to take a closer look at pages 55-59 of the plan for a list of structured projects, or the maps of these projects beginning on page 60. For your convenience, I have attached a list of projects that I thought would be of particular interest to people in my district. The plan also contains routes that are proposed to be short, medium, and long term projects. To see the specifics in map form, click [here](#).

To sign-up to testify in person at the March 21st hearing, use the [electronic sign-up](#); or you can sign-up in person starting an hour before the hearing. As a reminder for those of you who can't join us in person, the sessions will be televised on GTv. In addition, you can watch the sessions live or at your convenience online at [Watch Us](#). To see all legislation pending before the Council this month, go to our [Pending Legislation](#) page.

Of course, written comments are always welcome. You can send your

comments to me directly at jterrasa@howardcountymd.gov or share them with the entire Council at councilmail@howardcountymd.gov.

And, as always, please do not hesitate to contact me or my assistant, Kate McLeod, at (410) 313-3108 or jterrasa@howardcountymd.gov if you have any questions of if there is ever anything we can do for you.

All the best,
Jen

Jennifer Terrasa
Councilwoman, District 3
Howard County Council
Phone: (410) 313-2001
Email: JTerrasa@HowardCountyMD.gov

“Like” my page on [Facebook](#) and follow me on [Twitter](#)!

* For more information on biking in Howard County, you can also visit the [Bicycle Advocates of Howard County's website](#) at <http://bikehoco.org/>.

<Bike Howard Structured Projects_Shortlist.pdf>

FW: Bicycle Master Plan

Sigaty, Mary Kay

Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 10:33 AM

To: CouncilRecords; Sayers, Margery

From: Ed Wood [mailto:edwood44@verizon.net]

Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2016 3:38 PM

To: Sigaty, Mary Kay

Subject: Bicycle Master Plan

Dear Council Member:

My wife and I live in your District at 10905 Swansfield Road. We are emailing you to urge you to support CR35-2016 (Bicycle Master Plan).

We bicycle in Howard County and personally see the need for proper bicycling infrastructure and safety improvements. The Bicycle Master Plan addresses those needs. We are not fearless bicycle riders. We worry about safety. We will ride more if we have better on- and off-road facilities, bicycle parking places, and more safety conscious motorists.

Dee and I also see the need for the Howard County Government to update its regulations and design standards to be in alignment with the County Executive's proposed complete streets policy. The County Executive's incorporation of a complete streets policy as part of his endorsement of BikeHoward is one more reason that the County Council should approve the Plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ed Wood

10905 Swansfield Road
Columbia, MD 21044

FW: Ho Co Bike Master Plan

Sigaty, Mary Kay

Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 10:31 AM

To: CouncilRecords; Sayers, Margery

From: Stacey Shade-Ware [mailto:sshadeware@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, March 21, 2016 12:49 PM

To: Sigaty, Mary Kay

Cc: Clay, Mary

Subject: Ho Co Bike Master Plan

Greetings Councilwoman Sigaty! (and Hi Mary Kay!)

It has been a while since I have been a Howard County resident but I am back now and you represent me. Thank you for all you do for us!

I understand tonight you have a town hall on the bike plan for the County. Unfortunately I will be unable to attend. **I support the proofed bike master plan!** I hope you do too.

Good luck and have a lovely day,

Stacey Shade-Ware

Director

Stage Manager, AEA

Soprano, [American Military Spouses Choir](#)

410-218-5374

sshadeware@gmail.com

Please consider the environment before printing this email

FW: Ho Co Bike Master Plan

Sigaty, Mary Kay

Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 10:33 AM

To: CouncilRecords; Sayers, Margery

From: Dee Sullivan [mailto:sullivandee15@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2016 2:31 PM

To: Sigaty, Mary Kay

Subject: Ho Co Bike Master Plan

Dear Ms. Sigaty:

I live in your District at 10905 Swansfield Road. I am emailing you to urge you to support CR35-2016 (Bicycle Master Plan).

I bicycle in Howard County and personally see the need for proper bicycling infrastructure and safety improvements. The Bicycle Master Plan addresses those needs.

I worry about my safety when biking on county roads. I would ride more if we had better on- and off-road facilities, bicycle parking places, and more safety conscious motorists.

I also personally see the need for the Howard County Government to update its regulations and design standards to be in alignment with the County Executive's proposed complete streets policy. The County Executive's incorporation of a complete streets policy as part of his endorsement of BikeHoward is one more reason that the County Council should approve the Plan.

Thank you,

Dorothy Sullivan
10905 Swansfield Road
Columbia 21044

