

Item I: Consideration of Houston Bike Plan

Houston Bike Plan comments/requested revision and staff response

Note: Proposed updates are indicated in green underline italics

The comments listed below include SNA Top 10 and other comments received at 1/19/2017 Planning Commission Public Hearing as well as other comments received where updates are recommended.

#	Comment/Requested Revision	Staff Response
	TOPIC: PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT	
1	Specify that at a minimum there will be neighborhood level public engagement during design phase and prior to construction.	<p><u>Update Plan to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Final decisions on design and location of bicycle facilities will happen after additional analysis and public engagement. Public engagement should begin no later than preliminary engineering. Mobility plans/studies should be referenced to determine vision for streets within study area.</u> <u>Bikeway improvements as a part of City of Houston Projects:</u> <u>All Houston 5+5 CIP Projects take bicycle facilities into consideration based on the City's Complete Streets Executive Order. If a bicycle facility exists or is proposed on the Bike Plan, PWE evaluates design alternatives prior to the project design and engineering phase to determine if a high-comfort bicycle facility is feasible in the project scope. If a bicycle facility is feasible design options are evaluated and may be recommended. If a high-comfort bicycle facility is not feasible; the report identifies options for bicycle facilities in the near term or long term. Examples of options might include a wide shared sidewalk where feasible, or a parallel corridor for a bikeway facility. City of Houston CIP projects typically include public engagement at three stages of the CIP process:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Public has opportunity to provide input on projects during annual CIP town hall meeting.</u> <u>Public input is solicited on the conceptual design before the project moves forward to final design and engineering. Public meeting format allows the public to provide input via online public comments and the design is updated and released to the public.</u> <u>A final public meeting is held prior to construction of the project.</u> <u>Bikeway corridor implementation projects, not associated with the City's CIP process, along public streets that warrant pavement reconfiguration, should follow these public engagement steps or a similar process:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Coordination with key stakeholders such as District Council Member(s), Management Districts, public agencies, large institutions, etc. and conduct initial community engagement.</u> <u>Stakeholder/community public meeting in the neighborhood near the corridor to discuss plans.</u> <u>Notify stakeholders and community of final implementation plans and schedule.</u> <p><u>The project development and community engagement process for these two types of projects are graphically represented below:</u></p> <div style="text-align: center;"> <h3>ReBuild Houston / CIP Project</h3> <h4>Community Engagement Process</h4> <pre> graph LR A[CIP Townhall Meetings] --> B[CIP Approved] B --> C[Pre-Design Community Meeting] C --> D[Project Design] D --> E[Pre-Construction Community Meeting] E --> F[Project Construction] </pre> </div> <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 20px;"> <h3>Houston Bike Plan Project (Non ReBuild/CIP Projects)</h3> <h4>Community Engagement Process (Proposed)</h4> <pre> graph LR A[Project Feasibility - District Council Member(s) coordination - Stakeholder/ agency coordination - Initial community engagement] --> B[Project Design - Develop design alternatives - Stakeholder/ community meeting(s)] B --> C[Project Construction - District Council Member(s) coordination - Stakeholder & community notification/ meeting] </pre> </div>

Item I: Consideration of Houston Bike Plan

Houston Bike Plan comments/requested revision and staff response

Note: *Proposed updates are indicated in green underline italics*

The comments listed below include SNA Top 10 and other comments received at 1/19/2017 Planning Commission Public Hearing as well as other comments received where updates are recommended.

#	Comment/Requested Revision	Staff Response
TOPIC: PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT (continued)		
2	Specify that a neighborhood level public engagement process will be undertaken before bikeways are implemented, and specify the role that each city department and division will play (including particularly HPD, HFP, Parks, including Urban Forestry, Planning and PWE), and when, where, how and by whom decisions will be made (e.g., decisions to build or not to build a planned bikeway, and what type of bikeway to build).	<p>Response/Update Plan to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan makes a recommendation on p. 6-82 on ways to engage neighborhoods in the neighborhood bikeway planning process. The Plan includes implementation recommendations for City departments and other organizations in figures 6.7, 6.8 and 6.9. Urban Forestry is within HPARD – the Plan does not specify roles for specific divisions with departments. HFD reviews projects in cooperation with PWE – the Plan does not specify a particular implementation role for HFD. Coordination with all appropriate City departments inclusive of PWE, HPARD, HPD and HFD will be addressed in CH 33 proposed amendments. <i>Recommend that final decisions on the design and location of bicycle facilities will happen after additional analysis and public engagement.</i> <i>Reference ReBuild Houston public engagement process, including that public engagement begins prior to project design and engineering phase.</i> <i>Reference mobility plans/studies to determine corridor vision for streets within the study area.</i> <i>Recommend a public engagement approach for bikeway corridor implementation projects not associated with ReBuild Houston, along public streets that warrant pavement reconfiguration, including but not limited to restriping projects.</i> <i>Add language recommending coordination with all appropriate City departments during implementation.</i>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the implementation schedule and what projects will City start with? How will Plan be refined and updated in more detail at the neighborhood level per the implementation schedule? 	<p>Response/Update Plan to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bike Plan contains recommendations for a citywide network of high-comfort bike facilities in both short term opportunities and long term vision. Completion of the short term opportunities map and key connections corresponds with the vision of achieving gold level bicycle friendly status within ten years. The Implementation Chapter of the Bike Plan contains several key recommendations, including building momentum through pilot projects, such as the pilot projects highlighted in the Plan, and developing a package of short-term projects that can be implemented within existing street rights-of-way and seek funding to implement. While there is no specified implementation schedule, Houston City Council approved \$1.1 million per year for Houston Bike Plan Implementation in the 2017-2021 CIP. Some potential projects may be incorporated into existing or planned CIP projects, either in the five year CIP or in the 5+5 (ten year) project list. City departments are currently exploring funding opportunities for potential pilot projects, short term opportunities, and key connections. The City will also explore opportunities in coordination with non-City agencies such as the Houston Parks Board, the Texas Department of Transportation, Tax Increment Reinvestment Zones (TIRZ's), management districts and others. The Bike Plan includes a key recommendation to engage neighborhoods to translate the plan to the local level, and includes a Neighborhood Plan Guide, which uses the example of the Gulfton/Sharpstown neighborhood on how this was done for one area and how it could be replicated for other communities. <i>Recommend that final decisions on the design and location of bicycle facilities will happen after additional analysis and public engagement.</i> <i>Reference ReBuild Houston public engagement process, including that public engagement begins prior to project design and engineering phase.</i> <i>Reference mobility plans/studies to determine corridor vision for streets within the study area.</i> <i>Recommend a public engagement approach for bikeway corridor implementation projects (not associated with ReBuild Houston), along public streets that warrant pavement reconfiguration, including but not limited to restriping projects.</i>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statements about public engagement in the BMP and on the maps should say that public engagement shall begin no later than the preliminary engineering phase because that is when options for location and design features are identified. Clarify that the proposed bike facilities on maps would require public engagement before implementation. 	<p>Update Plan to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Add annotation on the published maps (short term, key connection, and long term) with proposed bike facilities to clarify that the lines on the maps represent recommended corridors and that public engagement will be conducted prior to the determination of the specific location and design for the bike facility. For example: The lines on the maps represent transportation corridors that are recommended for bicycle facilities. Public engagement beginning no later than the preliminary engineering phase will be conducted prior to the determination of the specific location and design for all new bike facilities.</i> <i>Reference ReBuild Houston public engagement process, including that public engagement begins prior to project design and engineering phase.</i>

Item I: Consideration of Houston Bike Plan

Houston Bike Plan comments/requested revision and staff response

Note: *Proposed updates are indicated in green underline italics*

The comments listed below include SNA Top 10 and other comments received at 1/19/2017 Planning Commission Public Hearing as well as other comments received where updates are recommended.

#	Comment/Requested Revision	Staff Response
TOPIC: BICYCLE TOOLBOX AND MAPS		
5	Specify commitment to build high comfort (level 1 and 2) bikeways (i.e., protected bike lanes as opposed to standard bike lanes separated from traffic only by lines of paint) and not to build level 3 bikeways (i.e., standard bikeways separated from fast moving lanes of traffic only by lines of paint).	<p>Response/Update Plan to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some flexibility to build level of comfort 3 and 4 bikeways should be retained if necessary to ensure access and connectivity. Plan makes clear on p. 4-7 that “Level of comfort 1 and 2 bikeways are preferred.” <i><u>This recommendation can be further clarified and emphasized in the Plan.</u></i> <i><u>Update Plan to reflect that comfort level 3 and 4 bikeways are discouraged.</u></i> <i><u>Clarify that the Bike Plan makes recommendations and not commitments.</u></i>
6	Revise blue lines on maps to show only bike lanes that are likely to be “on street” bike lanes and not shared paths.	<p>Update Plan to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i><u>Clarify map legends and text consistently that Blue Lines represent dedicated bicycle facilities within the street right-of-way. A sidepath within the right-of-way could be implemented where appropriate, based on context, design, consideration, and community input.</u></i> <i><u>Clarify that lines on map indicate corridors where bike facilities are recommended in sidebar or summary ‘How to Use the Maps.’</u></i>
7	Revise maps to add another color for bikeways that are likely to be shared paths constructed alongside street.	<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff does not recommend adding/changing map colors. The Plan analysis was not conducted at sufficient level of detail to determine if a bikeway would likely be a sidepath or would be located within the roadway. Plan recommends criteria for selecting design of the bike facility based on context, roadway characteristics and other considerations. Off-street bikeways are identified as green lines on the map. If a sidepath is ultimately recommended to be built within public right-of-way, it should be identified as a green line once implemented.
8	Specify design criteria for each different type of bikeway (e.g., minimum widths).	<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 4 – Bicycle Toolbox clearly outline the types of bikeways, design consideration and selection criteria. The IDM is the appropriate document to provide design guidelines and will be updated as such with future updates.
9	Avoid facilities on major thoroughfares; use collector streets instead.	<p>Update Plan to:</p> <p><i><u>Clarify that the Bike Plan Map recommends a network of corridors and general facility types to meet the vision and goal of the Plan. Every attempt has been made to use local and collector streets as they often provide the most comfortable and safe route for a bicyclist. However, local and collectors streets do not always provide direct, convenient connection to destination and across multiple neighborhoods. In order to create a well-connected network that people will actually ride, some major thoroughfares must be included. The Bike Plan recommendation reflects near and long term need for bicycle facility along corridors. If an appropriate local or collector street connection can be identified during corridor planning and design it will be taken into consideration.</u></i></p>
10	Clarify application of shared lanes and bike lanes.	<p>Update Plan to:</p> <p><i><u>Clarify that bike lanes may be used on local streets in some specific situations (Toolbox item 4.4), and that shared lanes may be appropriate on select non-local streets where a high comfort facility is not feasible and traffic speeds and volumes are low (Toolbox item 4.7).</u></i></p>
11	Page 4-7 has a bicycle facility selection flow chart which shows that if traffic counts per lane are below a certain level, and if a street is otherwise desirable as a bicycle route, then the number of lanes can be reduced for the addition of a bicycle facility. The flow chart does not account for traffic growth. It is recommended that a means of recognizing growth be added to the process.	<p>Update Plan to:</p> <p><i><u>Clarify that current and projected vehicular demand is taken into consideration as a part of any comprehensive design changes to the roadway.</u></i></p>
12	The BMP should state that design criteria to be established by the PWE department will be based on the need to create safe, high comfort bikeways.	<p>Response:</p> <p>The Plan includes toolbox recommendation 4.40, which recommends that the Infrastructure Design Manual (IDM) be updated to include the tools in the toolbox, which include tools to create safer, high-comfort bikeways. The recommendation also states that IDM standards should be examined to consider their bicycle safety impacts on streets where cars and bikes share right-of-way.</p>

Item I: Consideration of Houston Bike Plan

Houston Bike Plan comments/requested revision and staff response

Note: *Proposed updates are indicated in green underline italics*

The comments listed below include SNA Top 10 and other comments received at 1/19/2017 Planning Commission Public Hearing as well as other comments received where updates are recommended.

#	Comment/Requested Revision	Staff Response
	TOPIC: PROPOSED NETWORK MAP CHANGES	
13	Request to add bicycle facilities proposed in Westchase District Ped/Bike Plan and Westchase Mobility Study.	<p>Update Plan to: <i>Incorporate proposed bicycle facility recommendations on long term map for the following locations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>BW8 Frontage Road from Buffalo Bayou to Bellaire Road (off street)</i> • <i>Westpark Trail from Hunton Dr. to Briarpark Dr. (off street)</i> • <i>Hunton Drive from Westpark Trail to Westpark Drive (off street)</i> • <i>Wallingford Drive from Meadowglen Lane to Westheimer Rd. (shared on street)</i> • <i>Rogerdale Road from Meadowglen Lane to Library Loop Trail (off street)</i> • <i>Drainage ditch from Rogerdale Road/ Library Loop Trail to Meadowglen Lane (off street)</i> • <i>Woodchase Dr. from Richmond Avenue to Westpark Tollway trail (off street)</i> • <i>Elmside Dr. from Richmond Avenue to Westheimer Road (off street)</i> • <i>CityWest Blvd. from Westheimer Road to Briar Forest Drive (off street)</i> • <i>Walnut Bend Lane/Inwood from Olympia to Cedar Creek (shared on street)</i> • <i>Cedar Creek from Walnut Bend to Blue Willow (shared on street)</i> • <i>Blue Willow from Cedar Creek to Riverview (shared on street)</i> • <i>Riverview from Blue Willow to Harbor Oaks (shared on street)</i> • <i>Deerwood from Riverview to BW 8 frontage (dedicated on street)</i>
14	Request to add Center Street as shared on-street facility.	<p>Update Plan to: <i>Add Center Street between Houston Avenue and Detering Street and Detering Street between Center Street and Washington Avenue as shared on-street facilities to the short-term implementation opportunities map.</i></p>
15	Update map to reflect programmed TxDOT project for W. Airport Blvd.	<p>Update Plan to: <i>W. Airport Blvd. between Hiram Clarke and Rosehaven Drive, change from green (off-street) to blue (dedicated on-street).</i></p>
16	Update map to reflect pre-engineering study for Ranchester Road for need area N-2016T-0010.	<p>Update Plan to: <i>Add Ranchester Road between Town Park Drive and Bellaire Boulevard as a dedicated on-street (within ROW) facility to the short-term map.</i></p>
17	Update map to add proposed Chimney Rock/Rockwell south of Orem to Grapevine on the short term opportunity map as an off-street facility.	<p>Update Plan to: <i>Add proposed Chimney Rock/Rockwell south of Orem to Grapevine Street on short term opportunity map as an off-street facility.</i></p>
18	Update map to show projects under construction and recently completed.	<p>Update Plan to: <i>Add Lamar between Baqby and Buffalo Bayou and Holman between Smith and Louisiana to existing facilities map</i></p>
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add existing regional trails to map. • Add proposed paths in West Houston. 	<p>Response/Update Plan to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many regional trails are already shown, however, staff will work with adjacent jurisdictions through H-GAC’s Pedestrian/Bike subcommittee to identify regional connections and update regional maps. • Add the following to the Houston Bike Plan map: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Boheme from BW8 to Memorial Drive (shared on-street)</i> ○ <i>Woodway between Bering Ditch and Winrock Blvd. (off-street)</i>
20	Eldridge/West Oaks: connect Brays Bayou to Buffalo Bayou. Concern about route along off-street drainage easement crossing Westheimer. Want alternative north/south route to route shown.	<p>Response/ Update Plan to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed off-street route is on the long term network map, but does not include design details such as a potential crossing of Westheimer Road. Details such as a future crossing of Westheimer will need to be considered at the time of project planning and design. • <i>Add Briargreen Drive between Richmond Ave. and Piping Rock Lane on long term map to provide additional connection.</i>

Item I: Consideration of Houston Bike Plan

Houston Bike Plan comments/requested revision and staff response

Note: *Proposed updates are indicated in green underline italics*

The comments listed below include SNA Top 10 and other comments received at 1/19/2017 Planning Commission Public Hearing as well as other comments received where updates are recommended.

#	Comment/Requested Revision	Staff Response
	TOPIC: PROPOSED NETWORK MAP CHANGES (continued)	
21	SW Houston: connect Willow Waterhole to Brays Bayou.	<p>Response:</p> <p>The Bike Plan does show connections between Brays Bayou and Willow Waterhole Park via the Willow Waterhole bayou on the long term map based on information referenced in the Harris County Flood Control Districts (HCFCD) Willow Waterhole Public Access Plan.</p>
22	Shepherd/Durham reconstruction: prefer less costly, better engineered, more practical design.	<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bike Plan does not address specific costs, design or engineering of individual or potential projects. The Bike Plan provides planning level cost estimates for the high-comfort network and a toolbox of facility types that should be considered in the design of individual projects. • P&D will forward comments regarding this project to PWE’s CIP team.
23	Maps accompanying the BMP should be updated annually to reflect annual updates to the MTFP, and should distinguish between bikeways that are built and in service from bikeways that are merely recommended.	<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed changes to Chapter 33 would establish a biennial review of the Plan. Maps accompanying BMP will be updated concurrently with the BMP. • Interactive maps currently do and would continue to distinguish between existing and recommended bikeways; current versions of printed maps have a separate map showing existing bikeways.
24	The BMP should be revised to provide connections between COH bikeways and county bikeways.	<p>Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan includes recommendation 4.54 regarding coordination with adjacent jurisdictions including Harris County. • Every attempt was made to include connections to bikeways in adjacent jurisdictions that meet the high-comfort standard. Staff invites comment on such high-comfort bikeways connections that are missing from Plan maps. • Staff coordinated with Harris County and other adjoining municipalities during the development of the Plan and network maps and will continue to coordinate in the future. • Staff will work with adjacent jurisdictions through H-GAC’s Pedestrian/Bike subcommittee to identify regional connections, including County bikeways, and update regional maps.
	TOPIC: IMPLEMENTATION	
25	Define roles that each city department and division is expected to play in implementing the BMP including specifically, HPD, HFD, Parks and Recreation including Urban Forestry, Planning, PWE.	<p>Response/Update Plan to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan includes implementation recommendations for City departments and other organizations in figures 6.7, 6.8 and 6.9. Urban Forestry is within HPARD – the Plan does not specify roles for specific divisions with departments. HFD reviews projects in cooperation with PWE – the Plan does not specify a particular implementation role for HFD. • <i>Add language recommending coordination with all appropriate City departments during implementation.</i>
26	Further define roles for City departments.	<p>Update Plan to:</p> <p><i>Add language recommending coordination with all appropriate City departments during implementation. Add language recommending increased opportunities for training of staff in appropriate departments in the planning, design, engineering, construction, and maintenance of bikeway facilities.</i></p>

Item I: Consideration of Houston Bike Plan

Houston Bike Plan comments/requested revision and staff response

Note: *Proposed updates are indicated in green underline italics*

The comments listed below include SNA Top 10 and other comments received at 1/19/2017 Planning Commission Public Hearing as well as other comments received where updates are recommended.

#	Comment/Requested Revision	Staff Response
TOPIC: BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE		
27	Specify that COH will be responsible for building and maintaining all bikeways, including shared paths alongside streets.	<p>Response/Update Plan to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development and maintenance of bike facilities has been identified as one of four goals for the Bike Plan. Not all bikeways are maintained by COH; multiple agencies and entities build and maintain infrastructure within the City. <i>Add language that as the City implements the Bike Plan it will use best practices to maintain these facilities within its funding constraints.</i> <i>Add language that recommends that the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) be tasked with developing recommendations to address this issue and work with City to create plan for long-term maintenance of bikeways, both off and on-street.</i>
28	Concern that sidepaths will cause tree loss, prefer facilities on-street with porous pavement.	<p>Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facility design details such as pavement material is not addressed in the Bike Plan, but will be considered in the design and engineering of individual projects. Tree preservation will be considered in the design and engineering of individual projects and will be consistent with existing City policies regarding tree preservation and replacement.
29	Establish objective performance standards, time lines, and/or other criteria for measuring and reporting progress towards achieving the BMP goal of Gold Level status can be measured and evaluated.	<p>Response/Update Plan to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan already recommends development of an approach to collect data, assess performance and develop performance targets. (Key Recommendation 1.2 p. 6-10.) <i>10 year goal will be updated to year 2027 in Plan.</i> <i>Add language that role of BAC includes working with City in creation of annual report, and in achieving the 10-year vision and any interim targets.</i>
TOPIC: PLAN AUTHORITY, UPDATES, EVALUATION, GENERAL		
30	Specify that BMP is a guide and is not regulatory or mandatory.	<p>Update Plan to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Reflect that the Bike Plan is a master plan similar to other City master plans that outline the City's long range vision, goals, and recommendations for policies, programs, and projects; and is not regulatory.</i> <i>Add that capital planning and allocation must be consistent with existing COH requirements, processes, and approvals; including the CIP and City Council authorization of funding for projects.</i>
31	Clarify distinction between Bike Plan authority and amendment process and that of MTFP.	<p>Update Plan to:</p> <p><i>Clarify distinction between MTFP and its amendment process and that of the Bike Plan.</i></p>
32	Edit for consistency, clarity, and conciseness.	<p>Update Plan to:</p> <p><i>Update the final version of the Plan to make various technical, numbering, and formatting changes and copy edits. For example, changing the ten year vision from 2026 to 2027 to reflect adoption in 2017, adding sidebars and footnotes where necessary, revising diagrams and tables, updating Executive Summary, table of contents, and acknowledgements.</i></p>
33	Define the process for amending the BMP.	<p>Response:</p> <p>Process for amending the BMP is addressed in the proposed amendments to Chapter 33.</p>