MEETING SUMMARY
Active Transportation Plan | Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
3:00-5:00 p.m., April 4, 2013

SAC Members present: Hal Bergsma, Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation
Suzanne Hansche, Elders in Action
Katherine Kelly, Gresham
Todd Borkowitz, Citizen Rep.
Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser, Clackamas County
Kate McQuillen, Multnomah County
Jeff Owen, TriMet
Shelley Oylear, Washington County
Roger Geller, PBOT
Stephanie Routh, Willamette Pedestrian Coalition
Jessica Horning, ODOT (for Lidwien Rahman)
Brad Choi, Hillsboro
Aaron Brown

SAC Members absent:
Allen Berry, Fairview
Derek Robbins, Forest Grove
Jose Orozco, Cornelius
Allen Schmidt, Portland Parks and Recreation
Rob Sadowsky, Bicycle Transportation Alliance

Metro staff and guests present: Lake McTighe, John Mermin, Anthony Buczek (Metro); Matt Berkow (Alta Planning), Terra Lingley and Reza Farhoodi(CH2MHill)

Planning level cost estimates for network evaluation and recommended project list
Lake McTighe briefly outlined the approach used to identify average cost/mile for pedestrian and bicycle facilities for use in the evaluation of the bicycle and pedestrian networks and to develop placeholder costs for the recommended list of projects in the ATP.

Lake pointed out that additional background information was included in the *Developing planning level cost estimates for the principal ATP Network* memo that describes how the cost/mile for each broad facility type were identified.

- Hal Bergsma asked what type of lighting was included in the estimates for trails.
- Lake responded that costs include lighting at intersections and potentially along trails. The planning level cost opinions developed by Alta did not address lighting costs. However, the cost/mile estimate is conservative and many instances could include lighting. The memo is updated to provide clarity.

- Todd Borkowitz asked why including landscaping had been deleted from the costs. Lake responded that she had not found a good cost estimate for the region. Costs of adding landscaping to the I-205 trail could be a source. Anthony Buczek stated that costs like landscaping are often not included in planning level costs estimates, but that landscaping could be added back. Landscaping and other elements such as bicycle parking, wayfinding signage and seating have been added into the elements that could be included in the cost.
- Lori Mastrantonio asked about the potential of including Right of way in the costs. Lake responded that an effort had been made to develop the data on existing and needed right of way for the region. Scoping for the task revealed that it was beyond the scope, in terms of cost and time, of the ATP project.

Functional Design Classifications, Design Guidelines and Network Concepts

Lake gave a brief update on the changes made to the bicycle and pedestrian network concept descriptions. She then walked through the proposed functional classifications and design guidelines for the regional bicycle and pedestrian networks.

- Hal suggested adding guidelines for accommodating both pedestrian and bicycle traffic on off-street paths.
- Several members asked for added language/clarification on the off-street facilities that are also "Regional Bicycle Parkway" - these facilities will most likely always also be multi-use paths and accommodate pedestrians, but it is not clear in the definition or in the design guidelines.
- Several SAC members stated that 12' width is not enough for shared use off street paths that are also regional bicycle parkways where two way bike travel is desirable, recommend changing the preferred minimum width to 14'.
- It was noted that a cross section would be helpful to visualize the facility types.
- Shelley Oylear and other SAC members expressed concern about including the option for a parallel path or parallel lower traffic street as a design option for a bikeway on a high traffic street. If those routes are identified as parkways the design treatments for off street path or low traffic street would apply. High traffic roadways are also where a lot of the destinations are so the design guidelines should focus on creating separation on those roadways.
- Several SAC members suggested that the preferred, higher quality standards be listed first, with minimum following.
- Hal suggested using bicycle and pedestrian volumes (current and projected) to help determine guidelines for width.
- John mentioned that the guidelines for when bifurcation (bikes separated from ped traffic) or extra width is recommended on a bicycle parkway trail is called out as "where demand warrants"
- Steph Routh asked if amenities such as seating and wayfinding be added to the design recommendations.
- Several SAC members recommend that lighting be added as an element.

- Shelley asked if the buffer width for pedestrian routes could be a bicycle lane. Lake said that this had been considered but because it did not add a physical buffer, such as parked cars or a planter strip it was not included. However, raised cycle tracks could be considered a buffer.
- Todd Borkowitz and others stated that off street paths need to be paved.
- Steph Routh asked why the term "where feasible" was used for the 500' crossing standard. When would it not be feasible. Katharine Kelly noted that some areas my not warrant a crossing if there is not population, destinations. Roger Geller gave the example of Greeley not needing a lot of crossings. Lake stated that different wording would be considered.
- Hal noted guidelines should be added for parts of trails that may need boardwalk or other treatments, and where widths needs might be different.
- Katharine suggested including examples of actual facilities in the region to help explain the functional classes and where the design guidelines might apply.
- Shelley suggested doing different test scenarios on streets with different ADT.

Regional Destinations Map

- Hal pointed out that several regional parks were missing. Lake stated that she would correct.
- Brad Choi asked if the business data points were physical locations of jobs. He noted that sometimes the address where the employee pay checks are generated are the data point, not where the workers are physically employed, so a businesses with 18,000 workers in Hillsboro will show up as a data point in Portland where the checks are generated. He recalled that this issue occurred for contract employees. Lake said that she would follow up.
- Steph asked if the bus stop data was current or projected. Jeff Owen stated that it was 2010 data. Lake noted that all of the data is "current" not projected to 2035.

Pedestrian Analysis

Matt Berkow from Alta Planning presented on the initial pedestrian network analysis for the access and equity criteria.

- Aaron stated that the numbers are more valuable than the percentage increase.
- Roger asked how the data was going to be used. Lake responded that the report would include findings pm the areas where improvements gave the most people improved access. These would be assessed along with areas where there were a lot of traditionally underserved populations, such as low income and minority, and cost of adding improvements. This information will be used to help identify focus areas for investment.
- Matt suggested adding information on the numbers of people with existing access to destinations and the change in the number as access increases.
- Steph asked how "equity" destinations were included in the analysis. Lake noted that if they fell into one of the access destinations categories they would be included.
- Steph and Suzanne stated that it is important to not only look at where underserved populations live but also they places that they are accessing, such IRCO in the Cully neighborhood.
- Lake asked the committee for feedback on how to organize the data to help prioritize projects.

- Shelley referred to the Washington County bike and ped prioritization that used similar criteria and asked the public to help determine how to weight the different criteria. She noted that deciding what is the highest priority – most people with access, equity, etc. was a policy/political decision. Lake noted that the current RTP does not weight any goals or criteria higher than others, but the RFFA process has in the past.
- Lori asked if geographic equity would be considered. Lake stated that in regional projects it always comes up. Hal noted that most jurisdictions will look for it.
- Roger suggested organizing priorities by County or city.
- Shelley noted that it seems important to focus on projects that will increase the number of people biking and walking and therefore demonstrate the benefits of investing in biking and walking., which will lead to more investment, etc.
- Shelly recommended focusing on what tells the best story for active transportation.
- Hal agreed that organizing priorities by county was a good approach and agreed that the marketing potential of some projects was important.
- Aaron suggested not focusing too much on cost efficiency, need to understand that some large investments will provide tangible benefits to validate costs. In the short-term, picking the low-hanging fruit may make sense, but in the long-term, game-changing investments are needed.

Bicycle Network Evaluation – initial results

Lake presented on some of the initial results from the bicycle model. She asked the SAC to provide feedback on a proposed revised approach to using the evaluation outcomes to help identify the preferred bike parkway network and prioritize projects. She stated that the differences in mode share and number of trips between the three concepts was fairly minimal so staff are using the outcomes from all of the scenarios, including the 2035 State RTP scenario, to identify the preferred network – rather than choosing one of the three concepts.

- SAC members stated concern about reporting the mode share numbers.
- Shelley stated that the story really seems to be about the quality of the facility and how that impacts travel behavior and demand.