

CONNECTING VIBRANT COMMUNITIES

PUBLIC MEETING #1 – November 29, 2018





Agenda

Status Update

Community Engagement
Technical Assessment
Initial Findings & Assessment

Next Steps & Milestones
Questions
Interactive Review of Work Products



Combined Work Plan & Timeline



Community Engagement Activities

Group Discussions

- Focus Groups 3 meetings
- Community "Pop-up" events 10 events
- ESL Class Group Discussions 2 events
- Senior Center Discussion Group 2 events
- Somerset Co. Youth Leadership 1 event



Crowdsourcing, Social Media, Etc.

- Online survey close to 1,000 responses
- WikiMapping more than 470 comments
- Project website live since July http://bit.ly/WalkBikeHikeSC
- Press releases, E-mail blasts, Facebook ad
- More than 40 e-mail comments & suggestions

Survey Overview

Open early July through September 1st

- 958 responses
- 95% of respondents live in Somerset County
- 47% work in Somerset County
- 6% go to school in Somerset County
- Most respondents interested in dedicated facilities for walking and biking
- Traffic stress a common concern and deterrent

Travel Mode & Barriers

- Health and recreation are the most common reasons for walking and bicycling
- The most common barriers to walking are distance to destination (61%), lack of sidewalks (53%), and fear of vehicle collision (25%)
- Among those who have school age children who do not walk or bike to school, distance is the biggest factor (59%), followed by lack of safe walking routes (44%) and safe bicycling routes (40%)
- The most common barriers to biking are lack of bike lanes (69%) and fear of collision with a vehicle (60%)

Trail Use

- 76% of respondents have used public trails in Somerset County during the past year.
- 17% use Somerset County trails or paths more than once a week
- An additional 41% use trails/paths a few times per month
- The most popular trails are Duke Farms (62%), D&R Canal (57%), Duke Island Park (55%), Colonial Park (44%), Natirar Park (33%), and Sourland Mountain Preserve (33%)
- 59% of respondents use trails for walking and 22% use them for bicycling

Desired Amenities & Improvements

Improvements for Walking and Bicycling

- Sidewalks connecting to their destinations
- More bike lanes
- More off-road bike paths and trails
- Better connections between bike lanes/paths/trails
- Shorter intersection crossings distances and pedestrian refuges

Improvements for Trails

- Better trail information and wayfinding
- More trails in general
- Improved connections between trails
- More vehicle parking at trailheads



Interactive "WikiMapping" Tool

Problem areas

- Challenging and "stressful" intersections
- Barriers, gaps, and missing links
- Busy street crossings

Comments and Suggestions

- Desired routes and destinations
- New trails or on-street facilities
- Bicycle parking and amenities
- Favorite trails and locations



WikiMap: Problem Areas

- Problem Corridor Bike
- Problem Corridor Ped
- Problem Intersection or Crossing



Sample "WikiMapping" Comments



WikiMap: Desired Routes

— Desired Routes



Technical Assessment

- Previous Studies and Recommendations
- Crash Data
- Cycling Level of Traffic Stress
- Island Effect

Previous Studies & Recommendations

Reviewed 65+ studies & plans

More than 400 multimodal recommendations

- Pedestrian improvements
- Bicycle facilities & trails
- Enhanced crosswalk treatments
- Traffic calming
- Bicycle racks[†]

These will be integrated into the draft network plan

Crash Data Assessment

Total of 437 crashes in 3-yr period (2014-2016)

- 275 pedestrian crashes
- 164 bicycle crashes
- Total increased each year

Few deviations from statewide patterns

- Ped crash rate per capita about ½ statewide avg.
- More frequent on high speed/volume roads
- Severity higher than statewide averages

 Most deviations related to suburban/rural nature of County, more activity on busy roads

Crash Hotspots

Low

Crash Data Summary

Cycling Level of Traffic Stress

Evaluates comfort level of the cyclist

- Based on roadway conditions and context
- Identifies barriers to access and mobility
- Traffic Stress

Caused by proximity to traffic volumes, speed
 Reduced by lower speeds & greater separation

Goal is a "low stress – all ages" network

Four Levels of Traffic Stress (LTS)

Low Stress			High Stress
LTS 1	LTS 2	LTS 3	LTS 4
All Ages 8-80	Most Adults	Skilled	Most Experienced

Level of Traffic Stress

---- **1** 74% of all Roadways

excluding Interstates and Ramps

Level of Traffic Stress

Level of Traffic Stress

excluding Interstates and Ramps

Level of Traffic Stress

1	74%	
 2	3%	ofall
 3	1%	Roadway
 4	23%	

excluding Interstates and Ramps

"Island Effect"

Composite Low-stress network (LTS =1)

Initial Assessment – Engagement

- Widespread support and interest
- Traffic stress a common concern and deterrent
- Many prefer dedicated facilities
- Leverage partnerships for implementation
- Integrate with county and municipal planning and engineering responsibilities
- Goal is a "low stress all ages" network
- Emphasis on both mobility and destinations

Initial Assessment – Technical Elements

400+ recommendations from previous studies

- Most crashes on state and county roadways
 - Speeds, volumes, lack of facilities limit viability

Significant barriers exist in on-street network

- Highways, arterials, natural barriers, and terrain severely constrain multimodal access and mobility
- Limited on-street opportunities
- Off-street system essential to developing a viable low-stress network
- Reconnect Somerset County's many "islands"

Work Plan & Timeline – Next Steps

Next Up: Develop County-wide Network

Walk-Bike-Hike "Low stress - all ages"
Connect people with destinations
Emphasis on both mobility and destinations
Comprehensive, Interconnected Network
Reconnect the "Islands"
Includes on-street, trails, crossings, amenities

Your Questions and Comments

Somerset County Planning Division <u>WalkBikeHike@co.somerset.nj.us</u>

