

**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**Active Transportation Plan | SAC Pedestrian Workgroup**  
**Pedestrian Network Analysis Evaluation Methodology**  
December 5, 2012, 4-5 p.m., Metro Regional Center

*SAC Workgroup Members*

Brad Choi, Hillsboro  
Lidwien Rahman, ODOT  
Todd Borkowitz, Citizen Rep.  
Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser, Clackamas County  
Hal Bergsma, Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation  
Kate McQuillen, Multnomah County  
Jeff Owen, TriMet

Metro staff and guests present:

Lake McTighe, John Mermin, Robert Spurlock, Anthony Buczek, Kim Voros (Alta Planning)

---

SAC workgroup members walked through the draft memo prepared by Alta Planning and Design and Metro. Kim Voros from Alta attended the meeting to answer questions about the proposed methodology used.

Page 2 of the Alta memo, Access criteria: Lidwien Rahman raised the question of whether the NAICS code data, which provides a very rich set of data on the location of a wide range of services, businesses, government agencies, etc. was too detailed for the regional analysis. She noted that including so many destinations would make it difficult to prioritize investments.

She referred to earlier SAC discussions on developing a set of “regional destinations” (see Oct. 18 meeting notes). At the Oct. 18 meeting SAC had discussed defining destinations similar to those in Metro’s High Capacity Transit analysis (which determined by size and population served (e.g. colleges and universities but not high schools, no grocery stores, etc), but adding transit stops and parks. But the decision on what type of destinations and how to filter them, if at all, was not finalized.

Lake McTighe asked the workgroup if there was a preference for using the NAICS data versus a defined set of “regional destinations”. She noted that defining destinations was tricky (determining which parks are regional, for example, has still not been fully agreed upon). Brad Choi stated that it was difficult to say without really knowing what the outcomes of the analysis would be. Kim Voros stated that it could be possible to run a “proof of concept” analysis and compare access using the NAICS data and access to a limited set of regional destinations (yet to be agreed upon). Lake replied that Metro would consider the possibility of providing a “proof of concept” analysis for the SAC to consider.

Todd Borkowitz noted that civic destinations should be included in the analysis. The workgroup noted that only High Frequency Transit bus stops should be included as a destination. Lori Mastrantonio mentioned Clackamas Counties Opportunity Mapping and asked if the analysis would be similar to that. Lake said yes it would be similar in that it would identify the concentrations services and destinations. The analysis would then measure the ease of pedestrian access to those areas.

Page 3, key assumptions for Access criteria: Lake clarified that a network buffer would be drawn around LRT stations to provide for “station communities”(which are included as pedestrian districts); ½ mile buffers will also be drawn around corridors, trails and pedestrian districts.

Page 4, Equity criteria: Steph Routh noted that it is important here to show access of equity populations to destinations.

Page 5, Safety criteria: Lake noted that she felt that the measurement of safety was lacking since it is difficult to determine if safety has actually improved. Anthony Buczek replied that number of crossings was a good measure of improved safety. Metro’s state of safety report found that crossing barrier streets was one of the most dangerous locations for pedestrians.

Lake referred the workgroup to the memo “*proposed improvements for evaluating the regional pedestrian network*” and to the proposed methodology for automating crossing improvements to the network (project to improve the pedestrian network are not currently digitized).

A question was raised if a crossing every 530 ft was too aggressive. Anthony explained that making people walk further than 530 feet for a protected crossing on a barrier street results in a level of service of “F” for pedestrians and discourages walking. The workgroup agreed to the crossing methodology.

It was suggested that the location of pedestrian crashes be added to the maps. In order to help understand if using visual analysis

Metro memo on “*Proposed improvements for evaluating the regional pedestrian network*”:

- It was suggested that a map of the proposed improvements would be helpful
- Lake agreed, stated that the main objective in reviewing the memo was not on whether these were the exact, correct investments/projects, but to get agreement on the proposed approach on how to identify and add improvements to the network
- Lidwien suggested identifying non-paved trails separately from paved trails.
- Lidwien reminded that it was agreed to add parkways or a parallel route to the ped network.
- Mel Huie asked if the McLouglin Trail and Milwaukie LRT/Clinton St. Path would be added to the bicycle parkways list. (Yes)
- Lidwien asked if the Barbur Bridges were included (*they are included – the RTP project does not identify ped/bike as a mode served, but the project description does*).
- It was suggested to look at the STIP Enhance applications for other potential project improvements.