MEETING SUMMARY

Active Transportation Plan | Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting

Pedestrian and Bicycle Network Concepts

3:00-5:00 p.m., Nov. 15, 2012

SAC Members present: Brad Choi, Hillsboro
Rob Sadowsky, Bicycle Transportation Alliance
Lidwien Rahman, ODOT
Todd Borkowitz, Citizen Rep.
Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser, Clackamas County
Hal Bergsma, Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation
Suzanne Hansche, Elders in Action
Kate McQuillen, Multnomah County
Jeff Owen, TriMet
Shelley Oylear, Washington County
Roger Geller, PBOT
Stephanie Routh, Willamette Pedestrian Coalition

SAC Members absent: Allen Berry, Fairview
Derek Robbins, Forest Grove
Jose Orozco, Cornelius
Katherine Kelly, Gresham
Aaron Brown, The Intertwine
Allen Schmidt, Portland Parks and Recreation

Metro staff and guests present: Lake McTighe, John Mermin, Robert Spurlock

Principles

SAC members reviewed the updated principles and criteria.

- Hal Bergsma suggested adding a principle to take advantage of natural & man-made corridors where they exist, e.g. power lines, stream corridors, rail corridors, inventory them
- Roger Geller, Jeff Owen, Lidwien Rahman– Seems like more of an implementation strategy than a principle.
- Lori Mastrantonio likes idea.
- Shelly - Consider moving principle #4 to implementation strategies (buffers from traffic are provided on routes with high traffic volumes or speeds)
- Roger and Jeff agreed.
- Consider making a new policy – when a large project is built, make sure it includes active transportation, e.g. Milwaukie LRT
- Policies vs requirement – are two different ways of implementing principles. Staff will make recommendations on broad policies for RTP and specific requirements for RTFP (e.g. TSPs shall include an inventory of man-made and natural corridors for potential bike and pedestrian trails).

- Stephanie Routh suggested that a policy on scaleability, that certain routes need to be wider in order to meet regional mode share targets (which we might recommend to more ambition than adopted target (tripling biking/walking/transit) and to accommodate both bike and pedestrian travel comfortably.
- Shelley stated she felt this was captured in principle #9. Lidwien stated that the data does not dictate standards and that a policy or standard tied to regional performance that referenced data would be good.
- Robert Spurlock noted that FHWA has a tool that provides guidance on how wide a trail should be (based on counts/demand) and stated that he would share it.
  Note: Link to FHWA study on emerging needs for greater shared trail width
  http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/research/safety/04104/index.cfm
- Roger Geller noted that it would be good to have a standard to build facilities that would help achieve a desired mode split.
- Lake McTighe mentioned the Secretary Ray LaHood's office had issued recommendations for bike and ped design included recommendations for building to address future need and demand. Link to policy statement http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/overview/policy_accom.cfm
- Shelley Oylear mentioned AASHTO guidance for 2-way multi-use trails – 14 ft minimum
- Lidwien – need a standard for the region.

Regional Pedestrian Network Concept

SAC members reviewed the draft map of the regional districts and corridors. The map included large employers with over 500 employees, colleges and universities.

- Hal Bergsma noted that we should confirm that all 2040 Main Streets are included within the "mixed-use corridors" shown on the RTP ped system map. It appears to be the case, but we should double check since Hal saw a main street missing in the Bethany area.
- Rob Sadowsky asked if it made sense to overlap the network with zoning to get at where there would be more demand for pedestrian activity.
- Lidwien noted that it will be up to local jurisdictions and TSPs to make the last mile connections.
- Jeff Owen raised the question that the vision for the pedestrian network does not seem clear. He noted that it seems to include everything.
- Should there be a primary and secondary tier for the pedestrian network or a functional class?
- Where should the high-priority areas be for the regional pedestrian network: Hal B. stated that the higher density mixed-use area (town centers, regional centers, station communities to lesser extent). Industrial campuses should be much lesser in priority.
- Rob. S. suggested adding a health impact – focus on areas with higher levels of disease, etc.
- Jeff & Shelly – Don't add park access as equivalent to other destinations from regional transportation perspective.
- However, we will map the parks and include them in our analysis.
- Lake stated that we were not yet to the stage of prioritizing – we needed to determine what the network is, what is included in the evaluation. The suggestions for how to prioritize and filter comes next. The ped districts and corridors are already a way to prioritize since they leave out areas of the region.

Regional Bike Parkway Network Concepts

John Mermin walked through each of the bike parkway network concepts (Grid, Spiderweb, Mobility Corridors)

- Don't confuse bike functional class, with prioritization. (that step comes later).
- We could end up with a concept that's as dense as the grid/spiderweb, but prioritizes a sparer network for implementation

- Lori – add 129th corridor in H.Valley to the grid concept to meet 2-mile spacing
- BTA can provide input based on the feedback they are hearing from public outreach on the big projects needed regionwide.
- What's possible along a corridor changes over time
- Be judicious about where you take away motor vehicle lanes when doing modeling. Evaluate on case-by-case basis. *Note: To test the effect of removing a lane on bicycle ridership staff determined to test a few corridors, primarily those that appear on more than one concept. No lanes would be removed from the Grid concept for comparison purposes. See bike evaluation methodology memo.*
- Roger - From Portland's experience (and others around the world) , you need to take space away from autos to create the width for world-class designs
- Rob – the concepts look good.
- The mobility corridors does not seem adequate
- Roger- Show travel time changes with the model for the different alternatives.
- Lori - There is a gap in Happy Valley
- Shelley- The network needs to be dense.
- Shelley- Important to accommodate pedestrians on major streets, but Sometimes the main bike route can be a parallel route on a lower volume street.
- Shelley- Would be good to look at the projects in the RTP to see what is prioritized there and where there is lane widening – good to take advantage of for separated in-roadway.
- Hal - #3 (mobility corridors) does not take advantage of trails
- Jeff. There are less routes on#3 so it will not show up as well on the evaluation. (Will cost less)
- Provide feedback by 11/28 (Wednesday after Thanksgiving).