



**ADVISORY PLANNING BOARD
APPROVED MINUTES OF MEETING
Greenbelt Community Center
December 12, 2012
Approved Minutes Prepared by Jaime Fearer**

- I. The meeting was called to order at 7:37 pm

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: George Branyan, Jeff Lemieux, Brian Gibbons, Matt Johnson, Keith Chernikoff, and Isabelle Gournay

COUNCIL LIAISON PRESENT: N/A

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Jaime Fearer

OTHER ATTENDEES: Rayshard Rogers, Jean Snyder
- II. Agenda was amended and approved.
- III. The November 28, 2012 minutes were approved.
- IV. Updates
 - Mr. Johnson announced that the next TRU-G meeting would be January 5, 10:15 am—12:15 pm.
 - Mr. Lemieux will start and email thread to gather potential questions for SHA. The board will discuss further at the next meeting, and Ms. Fearer will then contact SHA to set up a meeting.
 - Mr. Lemieux updated the board on his correspondence with Chad Williams (M-NCPPC) on the traffic study and section of the preliminary sector plan (Mr. Lemieux forwarded the emails to the board).
 - Ms. Fearer gave updates on the status of the Preliminary GMA/MD-193 Sector Plan as well as the progress of the joint Greenbelt/M-NCPPC bike share feasibility study.
- V. Discussion and Feedback on Draft Bus Stop Evaluation Checklist of the City's Bus Stop Safety and Accessibility Study
 - See attached notes from the discussion.
- VI. Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan – Updated Draft and Next Steps
 - Updated draft is still in progress.
- VII. The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 pm.

**APB Notes on the Draft Bus Stop Evaluation Checklist – from APB meeting
12.12.12**

- **General:**
 - Template/model form filled out for training will be very useful
 - Include “Anatomy of a Model Stop” in the training
 - Any way to include more images – in training and on the evaluation form – would be useful to volunteers
 - Will volunteers evaluate each stop as part of a group? We think it may be useful to have more than one person work on the evaluation for each stop.
 - Include definition of the overall purpose for the assessment on the form
 - Need a glossary of terms used throughout the evaluation form (i.e. near-side vs. far-side; alighting; clear zone, etc.) that parses out terms and jargon in plain language
 - Phrasing as questions rather than as statements seems more intuitive (i.e. “Is the pavement in acceptable condition?” [after, of course, defining “acceptable condition”])
 - More room for notes in the right column needed
 - Will the study include the bus bays at the Greenbelt Metro Station? We think it should.
 - APB willing to field test a second draft before finalizing assessment instrument
- **The locational boxes to the left of the top picture:** We would like to see these fields pre-populated before being distributed to surveyors – will minimize confusion throughout the course of the project. How will volunteers know if the information is current and/or accurate (i.e. a stop number could be missing, or a stop listed no longer exists on a particular route)
- **Top right image:** What’s the goal of this image? Will it be specific to each stop? Can it be larger and labeled for better clarity?
- **Add to Sec. I:** Cars/parking block access to curb and sightlines?
- **#5:** What is the definition of “Unsafe (steep) Slope”, and how will surveyors be able to measure this?
- **#6:** What are the spacing requirements? If this is about distance between stops, it should be in another category.
- **#7-9:** What is the objective measure?
- **Add to Sec. II:** Bus pad present? [meaning the concrete pad the bus parks on]
- **#17:** There’s a checkbox for “Adequate Lighting.” Are surveyors expected to come back after dark?
- **Sec. IV:** Focus of this section should be about getting to the stop once you are on the appropriate side of the street (i.e. the crosswalk info goes into **Sec. III** instead)

- **Add to Sec. IV:** Can patrons wait for the bus without obstructing the sidewalk?
- **Add to Sec. IV:** Is the sidewalk connected to the curb?
- **#18:** Consider moving it to **Sec. III**, as the need to address if the bus stop is at a signal controlled or uncontrolled crosswalk is a traffic engineering element
- **#18:** We would suggest a more nuanced approach to describing the nearby intersection like:
 - If bus stop is at an intersection:
 - How many legs does the intersection have? (3-way, 4-way, etc)
 - How is the intersection controlled? (2-way stop sign, signal, circle, etc)
 - How many of the intersection's legs have crosswalks? (3/4, 4/4, etc)
 - (if signalized) Do the crosswalks have pedestrian signals?
- Regarding pedestrian safety at uncontrolled crosswalks, we would suggest the consultants incorporate this research into a discussion of what makes a higher risk transit stop, in terms of access to it. Basically, the instrument needs to ask if a bus stop is located at an uncontrolled marked crosswalk, and then ask what the number of lanes and volume of traffic is on that road, and if there is a median or refuge island. These are the significant variables in crossing safety as explained in the attached study article. The bottom line is that we would think that a large weight should be assigned to this question, so that if a stop is located at an uncontrolled location on a high volume arterial, like Greenbelt Road, it is flagged as a very hazardous stop. Then recommendations would have to follow that point to relocation or significant upgrade to the crossing (like a signal, in the most extreme example).
 - See the table on page 38 of the Zegeeretal pdf. This table's rankings have been modified over the last few years to basically mean this: C= Compliant, P=Possibly non-compliant, and N=None Compliant. This table is a good evaluation procedure to apply to all uncontrolled crosswalks in the study area.
- **#25:** We should probably call it a "landing pad," that's what WMATA calls it, and we generally understand "bus pads" to be the concrete pad in the road that the bus stops on. Can a question be added to **Sec. II** for the bus pad?
- **#27:** What is "clear zone"? Does this mean room for patrons to wait without obstructing the sidewalk?
- **#28-29:** The field for Sign/ Bus# / Route Info should probably be split into 3 different categories, and possibly for **#29** as well. Additionally, there should be an option to indicate that the criteria are partially filled/incomplete/missing. For example, the Mandan/Hanover stop is served by Metrobus and TheBus. Metrobus has a route number posted, TheBus does not.

- **Sec. V:** Typo in “Amentities” in title line
- **Add to Sec. V:** Is there shade?
- **Add to Sec. V:** Is there a trash can? – Remove trash can from **Sec. VI**, but leave “trash.”
- **Sec. VII:** Remove this section. This seems like a staff function, not a surveyor function, and could be confusing.
- **CATEGORY:** We would suggest removing this from the survey form. This could all be on the back end, and it does not need to take up space on the page the surveyors are using.
- **Points:** What’s the purpose of the points in each category? Are the surveyors scoring/assigning points? That seems like something the staff would do, and if so, the surveyors probably don’t need to know the point values, though ultimately it will be good to explain final ranking/weighting of points
- **Sketch:** Are the surveyors expected to sketch the stop? If so, can an entire blank page be provided, both for sketching the stop and for additional notes?
- **Back Image:** If the surveyors are expected to sketch on the back image, it should be larger and with obvious labeling.
- **Pictures:** Are we expecting volunteers to take pictures? If so, how? If not, this space could be utilized for more notes/sketch space