600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
www.oregonmetro.gov

Metro | *Memo*

Date: January 20, 2013

To: TPAC, and interested parties

From: Regional ATP/RTP Work Group and Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner

Subject: Summary of comments and edits to Review Draft 3 of the Regional Active Transportation Plan

---

This memo provides a summary of comments and edits to the Draft Regional Active Transportation Plan (ATP) provided by a regional work group that was convened to provide input on and finalize the draft ATP. Comments were provided between October and December 2013 at meetings; some work group participants also provided written comments.

Attachments

1. List of work group participants.
2. Review and refinement timeline.
3. Summary of edits in Review Draft 3 of the ATP based on input from the work group.
4. Meeting summaries from the work group meetings.
5. Written comments provided by members of the workgroup.
6. Review Draft 3 of the ATP showing edits in track changes.

Background

At the request of Metro's advisory committees Metro convened a regional work group to finalize the Regional Active Transportation Plan (ATP). The purpose of the work group was to provide additional opportunities for local jurisdictions and other stakeholders to review the draft ATP, provide additional input and develop a final plan that represents the broad range of interests and objectives across the region and that has regional support.

Work group participants

Approximately forty people have participated in the work group and provided additional input on the ATP. Participation in the work group was open to anyone interested. A direct invitation to participate was sent to approximately 120 people, including members of the original ATP Stakeholder Advisory Committee, members of TPAC and MTAC, Regional Transportation Plan local contacts, bicycle and pedestrian advocacy groups, freight representatives and other stakeholders.

Process

Email updates with meeting notices, meeting materials, meeting summaries and requests for comments were sent to a wide mailing list of approximately 120 people. In addition to the

workgroup meetings, Metro staff worked with various staff from local jurisdictions to refine the ATP pedestrian and bicycle maps.

Comments from the work group participants were provided at five meetings held on Oct. 10, Oct. 30, Nov. 14 and January 16.

The work group met on January 16 to discuss changes made to date and reflected in Review Draft 3. Metro staff reviewed the edits with the work group members. Work group members provided feedback on the edits made to date on the ATP. Several members provided written comments after the meeting. Staff incorporated the additional edits changes into the document or added placeholder text indicating a change /addition that will be made in the public review draft of the plan.

The work group indicated that the refinements made to the plan to date reflect the input of the group.

Next steps

Metro staff will incorporate any additional comments from the work group, TPAC and MTAC into the final public review draft of the plan by February 19. Another work group meeting may be held to review the changes and ensure that the work group is satisfied with the refinements.

A final draft of the public review copy of the ATP "Regional Active Transportation Plan – Draft Public Review Copy" will be available and discussed at the February 28 TPAC meeting. Maps will be included in the plan.

TPAC members, along with the public and other stakeholders will be encouraged to provide comments on the public review copy of the draft ATP during the six weeks of public comment. Metro staff will make any necessary changes to the ATP; these changes will be brought to TPAC on April 25. A timeline of next steps is attached.

Regional Active Transportation Plan (ATP) | Review & Refinement Timeline

WorkGroup Review and Refinements

Oct 10 ATP/RTP WorkGroup -first meeting/identify process & focus areas
Oct-Nov ATP topical focus groups - focus on specific topics identified at first WorkGroup meeting
Nov 1 TPAC – Comments from Chair on WorkGroup process
Nov 5 Metro Council work session - ATP Council liaison ATP project update
Nov 6 MTAC - Comments from Chair on WorkGroup process
Nov 17 Metro Council work session - Update on ATP refinement progress included in RTP update
Nov 13 MPAC - Comments from Council liaison on WorkGroup process
Nov 14 JPACT - Comments from Chair on WorkGroup process
Dec 6 – First deadline for ATP map network changes & refinement comments to ATP (same as RTP)

TPAC and MTAC review and feedback on WorkGroup Refinements

Jan 3 TPAC – Comments from the chair ATP refinement update
Jan 7 Metro Council work session – ATP Council liaison ATP refinement update
Jan 8 MPAC – Comments from Council liaison ATP refinement update
Jan 9 JPACT – Comments from Chair ATP refinement update
Workgroup proposed ATP refinements in review Draft 3 available for review
Jan 15 MTAC– Comments from the chair, ATP refinement process update
Jan 16 ATP/RTP WorkGroup - Second meeting, recommend WorkGroup ATP refinements/RTP edits
Jan 31 TPAC –Review of ATP WorkGroup refinements; feedback from TPAC
Jan 31 RTP Work group – Discuss ATP edits to RTP
Feb 5 MTAC- Review of ATP WorkGroup refinements/RTP edits; feedback from MTAC

Preview and overview of public comment draft ATP

Feb 28 TPAC- Preview of public review of draft ATP/RTP edits
March 5 MTAC - Preview of public review of draft ATP/RTP edits
March 11 Metro Council work session - Preview of the public review draft ATP/RTP edits
March 13 JPACT Preview of the public review draft ATP/RTP edits
March 21 – May 5 - *Release of draft ATP for public comments, along with RTP*
March 26 MPAC - Overview of the public review draft ATP/RTP edits

Recommendation on potential refinements to draft ATP & request for preliminary approval

April 25 TPAC- Recommendation on potential refinements to ATP from public comments
May 6 Metro Council work session- Review of draft ATP per public comments received
May 7 MTAC- Recommendation on potential refinements of ATP from public comments
May 8 JPACT -Preliminary approval of the draft ATP per public comments received
May 14 MPAC - Preliminary approval of the draft ATP per public comments received

ATP proposed for adoption

June 18 MTAC – Recommendation to MPAC on ATP resolution
June 25 MPAC - Recommendation to Metro Council on ATP resolution
June 27 TPAC – Recommendation to JPACT on ATP resolution
July 10 JPACT - Approval of ATP resolution/RTP ordinance
July 10 Metro Council – First reading of 2014 RTP ordinance
July 17 Metro Council –Action on ATP resolution, final action on RTP ordinance

Work group participants

Luke Pelz	Beaverton
Todd Juhasz	Beaverton
Karen Burehig	Clackamas County
Lori Mastrantonio	Clackamas County
Mara Gross	Coalition for a Livable Future
Scotty Ellis	Coalition for a Livable Future
Dan Riordan	Forest Grove
Kelly Clarke	Gresham
Carol Earl	Happy Valley
Brad Choi	Hillsboro/ATP SAC
Jeannine Rustad	Hillsboro/MTAC
Anthony Buczek	Metro
CJ Doxsee	Metro
John Mermin	Metro
Lake McTighe	Metro
Lori Hennings	Metro
Robert Spurlock	Metro
Josh Rice	Milwaukie
Mark Gamba	Milwaukie
Carol Chesarek	MTAC/Forest Park NA
Kate McQuillan	Multnomah County
Jennifer Vines	Multnomah County Public Health/MTAC
Lidwien Rahman	ODOT/SAC
Casey Ogden	Oregon Walks
Phil Healy	Port of Portland/TPAC
Robert Hillier	Portland
Roger Geller	Portland/ATP SAC
Tom Armstrong	Portland/MTAC
Courtney Duke	Portland/TPAC
Cora Potter	Ride Connection/TPAC
Todd Borkowitz	ATP SAC
Kari Schlosshauer	Safe Routes to School National Partnership
Hal Bergsma	THPRD/ATP SAC
Judith Gray	Tigard/TPAC
Jeff Owen	TriMet/ATP SAC
Steve Gaschler	Troutdale
Ben Bryant	Tualatin
Ken Burgstahler	Wash DOT
Steve Szigethy	Washington Co
Shelley Oylear	Washington Co/ATP SAC
Katie Mangle	Wilsonville
Nancy Kraushaar	Wilsonville/TPAC
Scott Sloan	Wood Village
Mary Kyle McCurdy	1,000 Friends of Oregon/MTAC

Metro | *Memo*

Summary of edits in Review Draft 3 of the ATP

Provided here is a summary of edits reflected in Review Draft 3 of the ATP based on input from the regional workgroup; the summary is organized by sections and chapters of the ATP.

General

Edits for clarity are reflected throughout the document. Images, text boxes and some sections of the document were reorganized or moved to accommodate suggested edits or to improve the narrative of the plan. Track changes affect formatting.

1. Chapter sequence was rearranged:
    - Chapter 3 (Findings and Opportunities) was moved to Chapter 12 and re-titled Context to Guide Strategies. This chapter provides information and a framework for guiding policy decisions so it was moved to directly precede the policies and recommendations chapter. This changed the chapter numbers for some subsequent chapters.
    - Chapter 16 (Planning Process and Stakeholder Engagement) moved to Chapter 1.
    - Chapter 8 was moved to chapter 8.
2. Throughout, references to the "2035 Regional Transportation Plan" have been changed to "the 2010 adopted Regional Transportation Plan."
3. Acknowledgement of regional ATP/RTP work group members added to acknowledgement section.
4. List of cities, counties and other partners added.
5. Maps will be included in the public review draft which will be provided to TPAC at the end of February.

Executive Summary

1. Reorganized around vision/ challenges/recommendations.
2. Reference to the region's adopted six desired outcomes added.
3. More information on funding and other challenges added.
4. Recommendations added.

Introduction

1. Added definition of active transportation.
2. Added overview of what is included in each part of the ATP.

3. Refined definition of regional ATP network; added information that routes and districts on the ATP networks are *eligible* for federal funding, but that projects must be on the RTP project list to receive funding.

Chapter 1 Planning Process and Stakeholder Engagement
This was previously chapter 16 in review draft 2.

1. Added more detail on the planning process.
2. Added figure showing general stakeholder engagement timeline.
3. Added section describing proposed adoption process, proposing the ATP be adopted by resolution and not as a component of the RTP. Changes to the RTP, such as new maps, would be adopted in the RTP by ordinance.

Chapter 2 Benefits of Active Transportation

1. Edited and added more detail to benefits.
2. Reworded titles to highlight benefit specific to the region.
3. Added new point under "consideration when implementing the ATP network" - increase in pedestrian and bicycle networks may not be a community's highest priority.
4. Added section "Community profiles – the ATP on the ground" intended to highlight successes in the region and planned projects that the ATP supports. This section still in process.

Chapter 3 Policy Context

1. Added a figure showing relationship of ATP in planning framework.
2. Added Climate Smart Communities
3. Added Appendix 5 with list of supporting policies and plans

Chapter 4 ATP Vision for 2035 and Network Guiding Principles (combined chapters 5& 6 from review draft 2)

1. Combined vision and principles in one chapter
2. Edits to vision to include reference to inclusive process.
3. Edits to principle #8 with updated terms for senior, low-English proficiency etc.
4. Section on evaluation criteria moved to next chapter.

Chapter 5 Integrated Active Transportation Network Concept (was chapter 8 in review draft 2)

1. Moved order of chapter to provide concept frame for evaluation and identification of networks in Chapter 6.
2. Added section on 'the special role of trails.'
3. New map showing regional and inter-regional trail network and connections to destinations outside of the UGB.

Chapter 6 Network Evaluation Criteria and Results (was chapter 7 in review draft 2)

1. Moved order of chapter to come right before bike and ped network chapters since it describes how the networks were developed.
2. This chapter has been heavily re-written to provide a better description of the process used to evaluate and identify the recommended regional networks.
3. Added a new section describing the steps in the process.
4. Moved evaluation criteria into this chapter.
5. Edited the findings from the evaluations to link how the findings influenced the development of the recommended networks.

Chapters 7 Recommended Regional Bicycle Network (was chapter9 in review draft 2)

1. Added more detail on how the concept was developed.
2. Added more definition of what is on the regional network and what is not.
3. Clarified information on bicycle districts.
4. Added new map – bicycle functional classifications
5. Added new map –bicycle on-street and off street
6. Added new map showing existing bicycle network and gaps in the regional network.

Chapter 8 Recommended Regional Pedestrian Network (was chapter 10 in review draft 2)

1. Added more detail on how the concept was developed
2. Added more definition of what is on the regional network and what is not.
3. Clarified information on pedestrian network concept.
4. Added more references to access to transit.
5. Added new map – pedestrian functional classification
6. Added new map – on-street and off street
7. New map showing existing network and gaps.

Chapter 9 Design Guidance (was chapter 11 in review draft 2)
This chapter was substantially updated. “Design guidelines” changed to “design guidance” to emphasize that the guidance is just that and not required.

1. Added section on ‘purpose of the ATP design guidance’ with more specificity.
2. Highlighted importance of context in design with a separate section and listed the types of information that should be considered as projects are planned and designed.
3. Added section on universal access concept.
4. Removed connection between functional classification and design guidance.
5. Added language that parkway classifications and districts at the top of the functional classification hierarchy should strive to achieve greater separation from traffic and best practices in design in order to provide a regional spine.
6. Replaced design guideline tables with narrative text that describes the benefit of design approaches. Added images to give a visual example of the guidance.

7. Added section on freight consideration with examples of design that is working for bike, ped and freight.
8. Removed section that describes ‘ interim’ improvements.
9. ‘Wildlife habitat and riparian considerations’ section reviewed by Metro conservation scientist.
10. Added ‘top 10 natural resource considerations for trail planners.’

Chapter 10 Targets and Performance Measures (was chapter 13 in review draft 2)

1. Added more detail on the updated data points for the active transportation mode share target.
2. Reorganized table 2 and added new column on the ATP network modeled data.
3. Added paragraph discussing table 2 which illustrates that region is not meeting active transportation mode share target.
4. Added table 3 and information on non-drive alone modal target.
5. Highlighted that serious and fatal pedestrian and bicycle crash data in table 5 involves autos.
6. Noted that basic infrastructure and access to daily needs targets need data and methodology defined.
7. Added in brief overview of 2010 adopted RTP performance measure results (moved from Executive Summary footnote).
8. Deleted list of system and performance measures from RTP – not needed.

Chapter 11 Trends and Findings to Guide Policies (was chapter 3 in review draft 2, called Findings and Opportunities)

1. Moved order of chapter because the findings provide context for the policies in chapter 12 and the funding and implementation strategies in chapters 13 and 14.
2. Added finding (b) to illustrate that communities across the region differ and require different approaches to implementing the ATP.

Chapter 12 Recommended Policies and Implementation Actions

1. Expanded intro paragraphs describing how policies are incorporated into the RTP.
2. Added definition to each policy to provide more detail on what the policy is proposing.
3. Highlighted access to transit as a priority in policies and actions.
4. Added specificity on Metro’s actions. For example if the action says Metro should support local jurisdictions examples of *how and where* Metro could provide support were added.
5. Edits were made to make language more consistent. Words such as consider, encourage and references to partners were made consistent.
6. Action 4.2 word consider replaced with ‘work with’ since it is a Metro action.
7. Identified implementing actions that are to be taken by Metro and can be more directive, versus implementing actions that require more action on part of local jurisdictions and are suggestions.
8. Added more terms, such as complete streets and Bicycle Comfort Index, to glossary.
9. Policy action item 1.3 moved to Policy 5.

10. Added language to policy action item 1.7 to clarify that this action is about the end of trip experience and filling gaps to get to transit; removed “where applicable”.
11. Policy action item 2.2 added ‘local’
12. Policy action item 2.3 added description on how and when Metro will work with partners on this action.
13. Cleaned up Policy action item 2.4 which was confusing.
14. Policy action item 2.5 add “and along transit corridors” but be clear that the main intent (as directed by SAC) was to focus on transit stops and along tracks.
15. Deleted policy action item 2.12 ‘work with jurisdictions, agencies and stakeholders to consider developing criteria for prioritizing RTP projects’; work group advised this is broader than the RTP and should be considered as an implementation for the whole RTP, but is not appropriate in the ATP.
16. Policy action item 4.1 (now 4.2) removed word consider.
17. Added new policy action item 4.3 ‘ work with jurisdictions, agencies and other stakeholders to identify and increase funding for active transportation consistent to achieve desired mode share for walking, bicycling and transit.
18. Policy action item 5.4 remove word explore; add reference to growing awareness of health impacts; add language to focus on providing data.

Chapter 13 Funding the Active Transportation Plan

1. Table 6 (was table 2 on page 93) clarified which RTP was referenced. Updated costs with 2014 RTP costs.
2. Provided additional context in intro paragraph.
3. Added section on Metro’s role.
4. Updated point 2 under ‘aligning projects with existing funding opportunities’ – noted that a policy change would be needed to apply ODOT fix-it funds to adding missing bike and ped facilities for safety. Added information on how state gas tax can be spent.
5. Updated point 7 with more detail on local funding.
6. Rewrote ‘cost estimates for the regional active transportation network’, updated cost estimates with 2014 RTP numbers.
7. Added text on figure 9 (was fig.7)

Chapter 14 Implementation Strategies and Projects

1. Added intro paragraph on prioritization.
2. Clarified and highlighted the recommended implementation strategy.
3. Updated strategies ‘to prioritize projects’.
4. Moved part of strategy three to its own strategy, #4.
5. Moved list of project areas into separate section.

Glossary and Appendix

Added new terms to the glossary. Added two new appendices.

600 NE Grand Ave
Portland, OR 97232-2736
www.oregonmetro.gov

Metro | *Making a great place*

ATP/RTP WorkGroup | October 10 Meeting Summary

Thirty-seven people participated in the first ATP/RTP WorkGroup meeting at Metro on October 10, 2013. Participants broke into groups to discuss questions on the agenda.

Participants

Anthony Buczek, Metro
Ben Bryant, Tualatin
Brad Choi, Hillsboro/ATP SAC
Carol Chesarek, MTAC/Forest Park NA
Carol Earl, Happy Valley
Casey Ogden, Oregon Walks
C.J. Doxsee, Metro
Cora Potter, Ride Connection/TPAC
Courtney Duke, Portland/TPAC
Dan Riordan, Forest Grove
Hal Bergsma, THPRD/ATP SAC
Jeannine Rustad, Hillsboro/MTAC
Jeff Owen, TriMet/ATP SAC
Jennifer Vines, Multnomah County Public Health, MTAC
John Mermin, Metro
Josh Rice, Milwaukie
Judith Gray, Tigard/TPAC
Karen Buehrig, Clackamas County
Kate McQuillan, Multnomah County
Katie Mangle, Wilsonville
Kelly Clarke, Gresham
Ken Burgstahler, Wash DOT
Lake McTighe, Metro
Lori Mastrantonio, Clackamas County
Luke Pelz, Beaverton
Mark Gamba, Milwaukie
Nancy Kraushaar, Wilsonville/TPAC
Phil Healy, Port of Portland/TPAC
Robert Spurlock, Metro
Roger Geller, Portland/ATP SAC
Scott Sloan, Wood Village
Shelley Oylear, Washington Co/ATP SAC
Steve Gaschler, Troutdale
Steve Szigethy, Washington Co
Todd Borkowitz, ATP SAC
Tom Armstrong, Portland/MTAC

Role of workgroup

Participants provided the following direction on the role of the workgroup.

- Determine how this effort (ATP and update of RTP) fits with local implementation.
- Determine what questions to ask and help guide answers.
- Read and review documents and maps.
- Determine what can be included (in RTP) this time, and what might need to be deferred to next time.
- Communicate to others (elected, other staff, other stakeholders) what is learned from process and provide better understanding of ATP policies, goals, benefits, routes, functional classes and design guidelines.

DRAFT

- Help achieve consensus on updates in the RTP.
- Make sure words are clearly defined and definitions are agreed upon (e.g. recommended, should, etc).

Desired outcomes

Participants discussed what successful outcomes of the meeting and overall efforts of the workgroup would look like.

- Answer questions that need to be answered.
- Consensus on recommended changes in the RTP.
- Realistic look at what is needed to achieve active transportation goals and targets and make sure they are included.
- Everyone understands each other's concerns and questions.
- Articulate the benefits of ATP and why is needed.
- The need for context sensitivity is highlighted.
- Plan addresses need to balance multiple needs of different modes, goals and environment.
- Plan results in more funding for active transportation.
- Establish technical workgroup to provide resources – solve problems.

Purpose/need for the ATP

Why should jurisdictions and agencies care about the plan? How could it benefit local jurisdictions? How will the plan be reflected in local plans? How are local plans reflected in the ATP? Participants provided the following input to these questions. There was a desire to come up with a 30 second elevator speech that describes the ATP and why it is needed.

- Bicycle and pedestrian routes/facilities cross jurisdictional boundaries. Increases connectivity.
- One of several modal plans for the RTP (i.e. Freight, HCT, TSMO); like other modal plans, it takes a closer look at one of the key elements of the transportation system to help achieve RTP goals and targets.
- Should be used to reshape existing RTP projects.
- Builds on the backbone of regional transit; integrates with other modes and increases access to employment via transit, bike and walking.
- Can help provide consistent approach to balancing active transportation and natural area needs.

DRAFT

- Should provide a tool kit for best practices (that have been implemented in our region), especially for jurisdictions that have limited capacity and resources to pursue newer designs.
- Gives jurisdictions ability to work together to increase funding for active transportation; used by leaders to advocate for regional-state-federal funding.
- Can serve as an advocacy document to help jurisdictions "sell" multi-modal.
- Indentifies barriers to implementation.
- Encourages change and implementation - carrots vs. sticks.

Topics, areas in the draft ATP and RTP update WorkGroup should focus on

Participants identified initial topics and areas that the workgroup should review and refine in both the draft ATP and updates to the RTP. It was suggested that Chapters 11-15 of the ATP receive the most attention. The suggestion corresponded with topics that the participants identified as important areas to focus on.

- Design guidelines/network concepts –role of the guidelines and how they should be applied, schematics and illustrations for different situations (limited ROW, built environment, new development). Make sure context sensitivity is allowed/emphasized, identify range of targets for guidelines- need flexibility but still need to aim for highest design; 14' trails are not possible in many places, may not be desired. Role of developers and caution on what to expect from development. How SDCs can be used. Guidelines seem to prioritize design over connectivity; network maps provide guidance for connectivity but balanced to both connectivity and design needs to be emphasized. Make sure mobility does not come at the price of universal access. Clarify the need/usefulness of a regional pedestrian network vs. a regional bicycle network. Regional pedestrian network concept is not clear.
- Maps/networks. Verification by local jurisdictions. Regional networks should reflect highest local priorities. Include overlay maps that show other roadway classifications for bike and ped networks. Include details on how recommended networks were identified (started with current RTP bike and ped networks, conducted GIS analysis and modeling to identify spine of system, added missing frequent transit routes to pedestrian network, added all urban arterials to pedestrian network, updated trails based on update of Regional Trail map, went through several reviews with SAC, public open house, input from other jurisdictions, review of local bike and ped plans)

DRAFT

- Funding –Do projects need to be on map to receive federal funding? Will design guidelines be required for RFF funds? With flexible funding we should aim for highest/best design but need flexibility. More funding for active transportation.
- Policies. Achieve targets and goals. How will ATP be implemented in local plans.
- Performance measures. How they were identified.
- What this means to local plans. Include one page summary.
- Process. Move process chapter to front. Highlight process how networks were identified. How policies were developed. How guidelines were developed.

Next steps

Participants provided direction on next steps.

- Create focus groups to dive into specific topic areas:
    1. Design Guidelines/Network Concepts (Chapters 9, 10, 11)
    2. Policies/ Modal Targets and Performance Measures (Chapter 12, 13)
    3. Funding/Implementation Strategies/Projects (Chapter 14/15)
- Report back to larger workgroup.
- Participants will review the draft ATP and draft proposed edits to the RTP and come prepared to workgroups with specific suggestions to achieve desired outcomes identified by the workgroup.
- Metro can provide GIS layers of the bike and ped networks to the participants.
- Metro will provide documents (maps, word doc of ATP, excel project list, etc) on ftp site
- It was suggested to provide some sort of work group platform (e.g. BaseCamp, Google Docs). [*note: various options were looked at and none seemed right for this process, either being too complicated for the short timeframe, requiring people to sign up for something new. Staff recommends using an ftp site for sharing large files and using "reply all" on email for sharing questions and comments.*

DRAFT

600 NE Grand Ave
Portland, OR 97232-2736
www.oregonmetro.gov

Metro | *Making a great place*

ATP/RTP WorkGroup | Design Guidelines/Network Concepts Focus Group

The Design Focus Group of the ATP/RTP WorkGroup met on Oct.30 at Metro.

Participants

Brad Choi, Hillsboro/ATP SAC
Casey Ogden, Oregon Walks
C.J. Doxsee, Metro
Robert Hillier, Portland
Jon Holn, Forest Grove
Hal Bergsma, THPRD/ATP SAC
Jeff Owen, TriMet/ATP SAC
John Mermin, Metro
Judith Gray, Tigard/TPAC
Kate McQuillan, Multnomah County
Katie Mangle, Wilsonville
Lake McTighe, Metro
Lori Mastrantonio, Clackamas County
Robert Spurlock, Metro
Roger Geller, Portland/ATP SAC
Shelley Oylear, Washington Co/ATP SAC
Steve Szigethy, Washington Co

Carol Cheserak was not able to attend and provided written comments ahead of the meeting (attached).

Action/follow up actions are italicized.

1. Role of Focus group/overview of materials/how to track changes

Lake McTighe referred the group to the summary notes of the first ATP WG meeting; at the first meeting the WorkGroup identified the role of the workgroup, topics to focus on in the review and refinement and guidance on how to move forward. The focus group did not have any comments to add.

Next, Lake referred the group to the track changes version of Review Draft 2 of the Regional Active Transportation Plan (August 2013). She asked the focus group how they wanted to track NEW changes to the plan. She suggested that the current round of track changes could be accepted in the Word document and that all subsequent changes would then be tracked in a Review Draft 3 document. This would enable changes proposed to current track changes items to be visible. The group discussed the pros and cons of adding to existing track changes or starting a new version. One main concern was that existing track changes would not automatically be “accepted” and that WorkGroup could propose revisions to track changes. Lake stated that yes revisions could be proposed to existing track changes.

DRAFT

The group decided to start a Review Draft 3 document to track ATP Work Group changes and comments. Metro will recommend this approach for the other two focus groups. A suggestion to add a note at the start of the document that clarifies that the WorkGroups edits have not been vetted by the original Stakeholder Advisory Committee will also be incorporated.

Lake then referred to the rest of the materials: handouts of the ATP guidelines under discussion; the ATP bicycle and pedestrian Map Books were not finalized for the meeting - links to the maps were sent out after meeting; handout of the PPT showing existing facilities that illustrate the use of the proposed guidelines in different and sometimes constrained places in the region; memo from FHWA supporting design flexibility. At least one member of the group said they would be unable to access the ftp site. Lake said she could send large files in a different format (such as You Send It).

2. Examples of design guidelines in the region – PPT

Lake went through a PPT giving examples of current regional bikeways and walkways in the region that illustrate application of the ATP guidelines. In some of the cases the widths of facilities were not the same as the recommended widths in the ATP guidelines, providing examples of how buffered bike lanes, wider sidewalks + buffers could be achieved in constrained environments.

Members of the focus group thought the examples were helpful and suggested adding examples to the ATP to illustrate flexibility and how in constrained situations the guidelines are modified to address the constraints and balance modes and desires of the community.

3. Discussion of design guidelines and network concept issues and how to address and/or clarify in the ATP

Lake referred to the list of issues listed which had been identified by members of the WorkGroup. Members of the focus group discussed these issues and potential actions.

1. **Role of the guidelines (e.g. recommended vs. required) and how they will be applied:** Members expressed that one value of the guidelines is to emphasize continuity between jurisdictions, coordination so high functioning – *this should be emphasized in the plan.* Members felt it was important to *explain in the plan how design the guidelines will be used/applied,* including in constrained situations and relationship to funding. *Clarify if guidelines are for the design of a specific network, for example the RTP has arterial design guidelines.* Members suggested creating a Wordle that highlights which words are used most frequently in the ATP. One member pointed out that some of the design

guidelines will result in slowing down traffic which could lead to congestion. Another member noted that slowing down traffic is often desirable and that slower traffic and sometimes congestion can benefit local businesses and communities.

2. **Need for flexibility while still aiming for highest design:** One member noted that the guidelines use the word "ideal", the guidelines may not be ideal to everyone. Another member noted that the guidelines are ideal for people walking and bicycling. *Staff will look at clarifying the difference between what's "ideal for bike/peds" and what's "ideal for the context" using the term unconstrained as a possible substitution.* Members also noted that examples of best efforts that fall short of the ideal guidelines should not be considered failures, and the wording on page 65 implies this. It might be better to build a mile of standard facilities than half a mile of wider facilities. Using words like interim and last resort gives a negative feeling. *Use of words in the plan will be reviewed.* Another member noted that the words flexibility and guidance are used throughout the design chapter and *offered to re-reading the chapter and identifying those statements that indicated that flexibility. An email was sent to the workgroup.*
3. **Need to emphasize context sensitivity in determining design:** At least one member recommended adding in a separated "call out box that highlights the needs of freight, and designs such as mountable curbs, freight friendly roundabouts, and truck aprons. Providing examples such as Rivergate off of Lombard and the St. John's area will help to illustrate how modes can be balanced. *Staff will include additional references on page 71, including reference to Regionally Significant Industrial Areas and the need to for freight movement to be prioritized in those areas.* Members suggested using more language that *includes creativity and tradeoffs*
4. **Widths of bikeways and walkways; balancing modes and use of public ROW.** Concern was expressed that in many places the existing road right of way is not wide enough to accommodate the recommended design guidelines and maintain the design for autos, or the ROW is so constrained that even adding in facilities with minimum AASHTO designs would be a challenge. *Examples illustrating how the guidelines can be used in constrained situations will be used.* One member suggested focusing on outcomes (e.g. safety) and describing the guidelines in terms of achieving outcomes. Resistance to losing on-street parking was identified as a barrier to adding bicycle and pedestrian facilities. *Staff will add language around p. 65 referring to constrained ROW.*
5. **Should bikelanes and/or cycletacks be counted as part of the pedestrian buffer area?** Metro staff asked for feedback on using standard bike lanes and/or buffered bike lanes as part of the pedestrian buffer area. Staff from Hillsboro expressed that they thought it should be counted. Staff from Portland stated they had seen some research that supported the approach of using buffered bicycle lanes. *Metro staff will review any studies on the topic.*

DRAFT

6. **14' multi-use path width.** *Clarify whether the recommended width includes the clear or shy zone. Include language on the importance of pull outs on trails/paths that are not as wide. There may need to be a different standard (wider) for bridges on trails because it is a constrained environment.*
7. **Regional pedestrian corridor concept does not make sense.** This issue was not fully discussed. *Staff will work on making the concept make more sense.*
8. **Maps -conceptual corridors vs. actual routes/facilities; how routes were identified.** *Staff will include more detail on how the networks were updated and the fact that they are taken from local plans. Staff will add language that articulates that a planned regional network is needed so that local jurisdictions can plan investments that leverage the investments of other jurisdictions; it is much more beneficial to invest funding into routes that connect to other investments made by other jurisdictions.*
9. **Tying design guidelines to functional classifications.** The group discussed potentially decoupling the design guidelines from the network functional classifications. Some members expressed that having specific design guidelines for routes on the map may be too prescriptive. *Staff will look at ways to organize the design guidelines that emphasizes flexibility while also emphasizing the need for safety and comfort.*
10. **Role of developers and what can reasonably be expected from development.** This topic was not fully discussed. *Staff will seek out input on this topic.*
11. **Connectivity (filling gaps) just as important as design.** The group had a good discussion about whether filling gaps or improving deficient facilities or improving facilities in response to demand should be prioritized. General agreement that filling gaps to complete the network was more important, but in some cases for jurisdictions such as Portland responding to a high level demand by improving existing infrastructure was equally important. Improving safety was agreed to be of high importance no matter whether filling gaps or improving deficiencies. *Staff will emphasize that completing the network (connectivity) and making it safe is a priority. Staff will reference the 5 design principles from Holland.*
12. **Balancing mobility and universal access.** This topic was not discussed at the meeting. *Staff will add reference to universal access to the plan and in the glossary.*
13. **Eligibility for federal funding; use of design guidelines as RFF criteria.** Some members noted that there is fear that the design guidelines will be required for projects seeking regional flexible funds. Staff noted that criteria for the flexible funds are updated each funding cycle and are a policy decision made by the Metro Council and JPACT. For example, the last cycle Metro and JPACT made a policy decision to allocate funding to projects that provided economic opportunity. *Language will be added to the plan explaining that criteria for regional flexible funds are a policy decision made by JPACT and the Metro Council each funding cycle and not set by the ATP.*

DRAFT

600 NE Grand Ave
Portland, OR 97232-2736
www.oregonmetro.gov

Metro | *Making a great place*

ATP/RTP WorkGroup | Funding Focus Group

The Funding Focus Group of the ATP/RTP WorkGroup met on November 13 at Metro.

Participants

Brad Choi, Hillsboro/ATP SAC
Robert Hillier, Portland
Hal Bergsma, THPRD/ATP SAC
Jeff Owen, TriMet/ATP SAC
Kate McQuillan, Multnomah County
Lake McTighe, Metro
Karen Buerhig, Clackamas County
Shelley Oylear, Washington Co/ATP SAC
Steve Szigethy, Washington Co
Kelly Clark, Gresham
Mark Gamba, Milwaukie
Lidwien Rahman, ODOT

Action/follow up actions are italicized.

Introductions, role of focus group, timeline, agreement on tracking changes

Lake McTighe referred the group to the summary notes of the first ATP WG meeting reminding the focus group that at the first meeting the WorkGroup identified the role of the workgroup, topics to focus on in the review and refinement and guidance on how to move forward. The focus group did not have any comments to add.

Next, Lake referred to the *updated* ATP review and refinement timeline (attached). She noted key dates for providing comments for the review and refinement – Dec. 6 and May 5.

Next, Lake referred the group to the track changes version of August 2013 Review Draft 2 of the Regional Active Transportation Plan. She told the group that the Design Focus Group had agreed on an approach to track new changes proposed by the WorkGroup and wanted to know if there were any concerns with this approach: *the current round of track changes in the August 2013 version would be "accepted" in the Word document and that all subsequent changes would then be tracked in a Review Draft 3 document.* This does not mean that current red lined comments and changes in Review Draft 2 cannot be revised – they can. The main comments to this approach was making sure that it was clear where changes were coming from. *Lake will*

DRAFT

add a statement at the start of the document that explains how changes have been made since the draft ATP was released by the Stakeholder Advisory Committee in July 2013.

Review and discuss ATP funding, implementation strategies and projects (chapters 14 &15)

Focus group participants opened up the draft ATP to chapters 14 and 15 of the track changes version of Review Draft 3 and provided comments to help refine those chapters.

1. Table 2 on page 93 –clarify which RTP (current or 2014) the funding refers. *Table will be revised to make it clearer. Update with new 2014 RTP numbers if possible.*

2. Relationship of network policy maps and RTP project list. The group discussed a question that was raised at the first WorkGroup meeting: Do projects need to be on the ATP and RTP maps in order to be added to the RTP project list and receive funding? Short answer is No. There are projects on the RTP state and financially constrained lists that are not identified on the RTP maps and there is no requirement on the RTP project solicitation forms that projects be identified on the maps. *The focus group felt that this should be made clear in the ATP (probably at the start of Ch. 14 and where the project list is defined) while also emphasizing that we (the region) should move in the direction of consistency on maps and project lists, so that projects in the RTP are helping build out the planned networks. Participants also requested that Lake provide information to local jurisdictions on projects that are on the RTP financially constrained and state lists but that are not identified on the ATP and RTP maps.*

3. Regional network definition. Discussion about whether projects need to be on the map led to a broader discussion about what constitutes the "regional" bike and pedestrian network and how this directs funding decisions. Lake handed out the regional system definition from Chapter 2 of the RTP. Currently the regional bike and pedestrian system is defined as whatever is on the bicycle and pedestrian RTP maps. The draft ATP maps will update the current RTP maps. While for the auto network the regional system is generally confined to major roadways and regional centers, the regional bicycle and pedestrian networks can include local streets, especially for bicycling when these streets provide an alternate parallel route to a constrained major roadway where bicycle improvements will be challenging.

   A concern was raised that the regional pedestrian corridor concept is challenging because most pedestrian trips are local – most people will not be taking long walking

trips along these major streets so should they be prioritized as regional – maybe access to schools along local streets is more important. The group discussed how the regional pedestrian corridors are transit routes and people make regional trips walking to and from transit. Major corridors also have a lot of destinations that people may want to walk to. *Add more detailed definition to the ATP of what the regional system is.*

A question was raised whether trails in natural areas should be part of the regional transportation system? *Some trails in the ATP connect to and through natural areas. And connecting to parks and natural areas was included as a regional destination.*

A question was raised about the potential redundancy in the regional network when you have parallel on-street and trail routes (e.g. trail Smith and Bybee Lakes and parallel path along roadway). *The routes provide different types of travel experience for different users.*

More language will be added to chapter 14 referencing the RTP regional system definition.

4. *Add more information on funding sources, such as CMAQ, etc.) and what they can be spent on to the funding opportunities section on page 90.*

5. *p. 90, #2. Add that state gas tax only goes to ROW, clarify what $$ can go to ROW and non ROW. Add reference to the STIP. Clarify that fix-it program current policy would need to be changed to be considered for funding roadway maintenance that includes adding missing facilities, such as sidewalks, and improving safety.*

6. *P. 90-22, add more examples of how and where funding is currently being spent.*

7. *p. 92 #7 mention that some SDCs and urban renewal funds are used for recreational facilities and parks and trails (Eastbank Esplanade example)*

8. *p. 110, Project list. Don't call project list, rename to "Network Segments" or "gaps and deficiencies, and solutions" or Network Status or something that is more descriptive.*

DRAFT

600 NE Grand Ave
Portland, OR 97232-2736
www.oregonmetro.gov

Metro | *Making a great place*

ATP/RTP WorkGroup | Policy Focus Group

The Policy Focus Group of the ATP/RTP WorkGroup met on November 13 at Metro.

Participants

Robert Hillier, Portland
Hal Bergsma, THPRD/ATP SAC
Jeff Owen, TriMet/ATP SAC
Kate McQuillan, Multnomah County
Lake McTighe, Metro
Karen Buerhig, Clackamas County
Shelley Oylear, Washington Co/ATP SAC
Kelly Clark, Gresham
Mark Gamba, Milwaukie
Lidwien Rahman, ODOT
Jeanne Rustad, Hillsboro
Mary Kyle McCurdy, 1000 Friends of Oregon

Action/follow up actions are italicized.

Introductions, role of focus group, timeline, agreement on tracking changes

Lake McTighe referred the group to the summary notes of the first ATP WG meeting reminding the focus group that at the first meeting the WorkGroup identified the role of the workgroup, topics to focus on in the review and refinement and guidance on how to move forward. The focus group did not have any comments to add.

Next, Lake referred to the *updated* ATP review and refinement timeline (attached). She noted key dates for providing comments for the review and refinement – Dec. 6 and May 5.

Next, Lake referred the group to the track changes version of August 2013 Review Draft 2 of the Regional Active Transportation Plan. She told the group that the Design Focus Group had agreed on an approach to track new changes proposed by the WorkGroup and wanted to know if there were any concerns with this approach: *the current round of track changes in the August 2013 version would be "accepted" in the Word document and that all subsequent changes would then be tracked in a Review Draft 3 document.* This does not mean that current red lined comments and changes in Review Draft 2 cannot be revised – they can. The main comment to this approach was making sure that it was clear where changes were coming from. *Lake will add a statement at the start of the document that explains how changes have been made since the draft ATP was released by the Stakeholder Advisory Committee in July 2013.*

DRAFT

Staff will provide a memo describing proposed option(s) for how the ATP can be adopted, either by resolution or ordinance, and either combined or separately with the RTP for the ATP/RTP Workgroup to discuss.

Review and discuss ATP policies, modal targets and performance measures (Chapters 12 &13)

Focus group participants opened up the draft ATP to chapters 12 and 13 of the track changes version of Review Draft 3 and provided comments to help refine those chapters.

1. In policies and implementing actions use words like consider and encourage more consistently; however in some cases the softening of language goes too far, especially where Metro is taking the action (specific recommendations are provided below). *Staff will provided recommended revisions for review.*

2. Identify implementing actions that are to be taken by Metro and can be more directive, versus implementing actions that require more action on part of local jurisdictions and are suggestions.

3. *Add explanatory paragraph to each policy to provide more detail on what the policy is proposing.*

4. *Call out access to transit as a priority and priority destination in relevant implementing actions, especially in Policy 1.*

5. *Add more term, such as complete streets, Bicycle Comfort Index, to glossary.*

6. *Policy action item1.1 give examples of how Metro could provide support(e.g. technical support); separate out the encouragement of the use of the design guidelines into separate action.*

7. *Policy action item 1.3 move reference to open source data to Policy 5.*

8. *Policy action item 1.7 clarify that this action is about the end of trip experience; add another action about filling gaps to get to transit; remove "where applicable".*

9. *Policy action item 2.2 add 'local'*

DRAFT

10. *Policy action item 2.3 describe how and when Metro will work with partners on this action.*

11. Policy action item 2.4 is confusing. Too many different guidelines mentioned. *Focus on ATP guidelines that reference these guidelines and use action to encourage local jurisdictions to adopt flexibility as in FHWA guidelines.*

12. *Policy action item 2.5 add "and along transit corridors" but be clear that the main intent (as directed by SAC) was to focus on transit stops and along tracks.*

13. Policy action item 2.12 is broader than the RTP and should be considered as an implementation for the whole RTP, but is not appropriate in the ATP. Use of word "consider" too soft. (Another felt it was not too soft). *Staff will look into adding it as an implementation item in the RTP and removing from the ATP.*

14. *Policy action item 4.1 remove word consider; make consistent with performance measures chapter.*

15. *Policy action item 4.2 add "work with partners to.."; define or add to glossary, pedestrian comfort and bicycle comfort index.*

16. *Policy action item 4.3 should be roadway maintenance.*

17. *Policy action item 5.4 remove word explore; add reference to growing awareness of health impacts; add language to focus on providing data.*

18. Active Transportation mode share table, p. 83. *Rearrange order of columns, put target in the middle, clarify which RTP network (the one adopted in 2010) add in ATP network evaluation mode share results. Add explanatory paragraph with information on why targets are not being reached (i.e. other policy levers such as pricing were not included in the ATP modeling). Look into TSP updates that are meeting the targets. Define what the tripling of the modeled mode share means. Update table with 2014 RTP data if possible. Include more information on the data being used.*

19. *P. 83-84 Add non-SOV targets. Add results of modeling from 2014 RTP*

DRAFT

20. Crashes table p. 84. Confirm and note that all bike and ped crashes include an auto.

21. The group did not discuss the other performance measures. *Staff will look at convening a performance measures group.*

DRAFT

December 18, 2013

Lake Strongheart McTighe
Project Manager
Active Transportation
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232-2736
lake.mctighe@oregonmetro.gov

Re: Input on Safe Routes to School as part of the ATP/RTP WorkGroup process

Dear Lake,

On behalf of the Safe Routes to School National Partnership, we would like to thank Metro for this opportunity to provide input to the current draft of the Active Transportation Plan (ATP) through the ATP/RTP WorkGroup process. The Safe Routes to School National Partnership, together with America Walks, is working in coalition to improve the ability for all children and people to walk and engage in active transportation, with a focus on issues of social equity, Safe Routes to School, and the walkability of business districts. We find that there is incredible support, as well as leadership, in these areas across the region.

Inclusion of Safe Routes to School in the ATP can be a model at the regional level of the importance of Safe Routes to School programs, which have been demonstrated here and in other regions across the country to improve mobility and traffic safety, help reduce short car trips, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve health and safety. Unfortunately, support of these programs and related active transportation infrastructure improvements has not been fully realized at the regional level, and has also suffered setbacks in Federal funding in recent years. We believe that including significant wording showing the importance and support of Safe Routes to School at a regional level will be a positive step in ensuring this region's next generation can have access to active transportation through Safe Routes to School.

We strongly support the vision of the Regional Active Transportation Plan and will be strong proponents to help propel its implementation. From the current draft, we have numerous comments related to Safe Routes to School, transportation equity and the walkability of centers and districts, and hope that they will be strongly considered.

Overall, we respectfully suggest:

- Strengthening the language in the ATP as well as the RTP in order to ensure its efficacy. For example, using "must" instead of "should" and "ensure" instead of "consider/support/increase" (as appropriate).
- Honing in on the implementation strategy. We want to ensure that this plan helps clarify your next steps to begin rapidly and robustly implementing the vision. We pose the question that this plan may not have a strong enough implementation strategy to set Metro in motion for a robust effort to complete the Active Transportation network.

Safe Routes to School National Partnership
Kari Schlosshauer, Pacific Northwest Regional Policy Manager
503-734-0813, kari@saferoutespartnership.org

We respectfully suggest the following specific recommendations to the current draft:
p. 9
Land use, pricing policies, education and encouragement programs, and other strategies …
p. 11
Suggest specifying amount by which funding has decreased over the past 5-10 years.
p. 12
Under "Better integrate transit, walking and bicycle networks" bullet:
Region wide, nearly 85% of allEvery transit trips start as aincludes active transportation at some point (walking, or bicycling or use of a mobility device). trip.
p. 20
Under "There are numerous economic, social, health and environmental benefits of active transportation." …
Though walking and biking networks are incomplete, they already provide a substantial return on investment. Every point greater than 70 on Walk Score (the website rating the walkability of any address in America) results in increased rent of 90 cents per square foot for commercial property, and a rise in value of $20 per square foot for residential property. Part of what's fueling this trend is the well-documented preference of the Millennial Generation to live in walkable neighborhoods along with growing interest from older generations in active lifestyles. (source: http://www.everybodywalk.org/media_assets/WalkingAsAWayOfLife1_Final.pdf)
p. 23
Under "Investing in the active transportation network increases access to destinations" bullet:
Within a safe and protected 1 mile walk of transit, parks, schools, food, civic…
p. 26
Under "Potential for more walking and bicycling crashes" bullet:
Studies show that in most cases more people walking and bicycling in greater numbers can lowers crash rates and makes the system safer for all…
Suggest including reference to at least one study.
p. 39
8. Increases Ensures access to regional destinations for low income, minority … youth … populations.
p. 61
Under "Pedestrian Districts"
A Pedestrian District is an area with a concentration of transit, commercial, cultural, institutional, educational and/or recreational…
p. 63
Under "Regional Pedestrian Corridors"
These routes are also expected to see a high level of pedestrian activity, such as through school pedestrian traffic, though not as high as the Parkways.
p. 71
Adding missing pedestrian and bicycle facilities to roadways can impact other transportation modes, including transit and freight. When properly implemented, pedestrian and bicycle facilities have a positive impact because they remove single-occupant vehicles from the roadway, thus freeing up space for freight and transit. Instances where the implementation of bike and pedestrian facilities have negative impacts due to space restrictions should be minimized.
p. 77
Policy 1. Make walking and bicycling the most convenient, safe and enjoyable transportation choices for short trips.
1.6 Work with partners to identify opportunity areas … support the development of projects and programs, such as Drive Less Save More, Safe Routes to School and Bike Share …
Suggest including a new point:

1.8 Prioritize making all town centers and business districts walkable, as places that people need to go for commerce, choose to visit for tourism, and can access services and social interaction.
p. 78
2.1 Encourage the use of complete streets checklists for planning and project development.
We respectfully suggest Metro considers adding language following this sentence that would require these checklists be used prior to receiving funding from Metro.
2.3 Work with jurisdictions, agencies and stakeholders to emphasize the need for and facilitate the implementation of infrastructure that facilitates safe and comfortable walking and bicycling, such as physically separated pedestrian and bicycle facilities, landscaped and buffered pedestrian routes, improved crossings, lighting and other safety features, especially on roadways with high traffic speeds, volumes, or heavy truck traffic. Physically separated bicycle facilities include standard bicycle lanes buffered bicycle lanes and cycletracks. Physically separated pedestrian facilities include sidewalks and separated pathways.
p. 79
2.10 Work with jurisdictions, agencies and stakeholders to consider addingadd pedestrian …
p. 80
3.2 … to provide awareness programs and address physical barriers …
We respectfully suggest adding a new action point that would recognize transportation, as the second highest household expense for the average American, is a social justice issue:
3.4 Prioritize building out the active transportation networks to 100% connectivity, providing a new world of transportation options for all people.
4.1 *We respectfully suggest the second sentence in this action becomes an own point:* Consider Ddeveloping and work on adopting a 'complete network' and complete streets policy and performance target where the regional pedestrian and bicycle networks are completed to match roadway network percentage of completeness.
4.3 Work with stakeholders to explore developing a policy …
We respectfully suggest adding a new action point that would raise the profile of the need for AT projects and allow the regional pedestrian and bicycle networks to be completed in a timely manner:
4.4 Fund active transportation projects at a level consistent with desired modal share for active transportation, as identified in the RTP.
p. 81
5.3 Work with partners to support the Oregon Household Activity Survey and to include the survey of pedestrian and bicycle activity, including travel to school activity and the relationship between bicycle and transit travel in the region.
5.4 Partner with health organizations to explore measuring and possibly incorporating health outcomes, such as including Health Impact Analysis and levels of physical activity into regional plans.
p. 89
Chapter 14: Funding the Active Transportation Network
We respectfully suggest including language at the beginning of this chapter that will help make the case for the need for funding and the dire condition funding is currently in. Possible language could include the following (and apologies that we could not provide all of the figures for these percentages):
Over the past 5-10 years, Metro's expenditure on active transportation projects has been an average of $XX per year, which accounts for a total of XX% of Metro's **total** expenditure on transportation projects for all modes. Current mode share for active transportation in the region, including walking, bicycling, and transit, is 16.2% (Metro's 2011 Travel Activity Survey). The projected goal in the RTP in 2035 for this mode share is triple that, or XX%. In order for the region to meet this and other goals, funding for active transportation projects from the entire transportation budget must at a minimum match the *current* mode share, and Metro should work towards funding projects at a share that matches the RTP goals for active transportation in 2035.

p. 90
Under bullet point 2.
The Fix-it program is focused on maintaining the existing infrastructure and safety. Non-infrastructure funding, including transportation education programs such as Safe Routes to School, is allocated through ODOT's Transportation Safety Division.
p.91
Under bullet point 3.
Suggest changing description of Connect Oregon funds to past tense, as V has now been awarded. Suggest including a note about the large number and cost of bike/ped projects requesting funds in round V, which was well over available funding, as this is a clear indication of demand. [http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/COMM/Pages/nr13120301.aspx]
p.93
Comment: 3.2 bil is estimated for completing the AT networks; 1.2 bil is programmed. Include information on how much is available/ historically spent?
The cost of all AT projects is relatively small compared with other types of transportation project costs such as bridges. When AT projects are invested in today, they can be completed at a lower cost today, which will help lower costs and free up funding for other transportation projects in the future.
p.95 & 96
Suggest including a statement on p. 95 that references Table 3, which is a powerful argument for increasing funding, yet it does not appear to be referenced in the text of this chapter. Initial suggested language for this chapter should be reiterated and strengthened here:
At the current rate of funding for stand-alone bicycle and pedestrian projects, approximately $10 million/year, it is estimated to take approximately 150 years to complete and expand the regional pedestrian and bicycle network. Current mode share for active transportation in the region, including walking, bicycling, and transit, is XX%. The projected goal in the RTP in 2035 for this mode share is XX%, a threefold increase. In order for the region to meet this and other goals, funding percentages for active transportation projects must at a minimum match the current mode share, and Metro should work towards funding projects at a share that matches the RTP goals for active transportation in 2035. If current funding rate were tripled to $30 million/year, the planned regional pedestrian and bicycle parkway networks would be upgraded, expanded, and completed within 50 years.
p. 98
Suggest striking this entire paragraph. Focusing investments strategically to get the highest return on investment is important. However, in many ways the region has not yet reached a decision place of which walking and bicycling projects to prioritize; if the goal is to increase opportunities to walk, bicycle and take transit, completing of the networks is needed.
The overall recommended approach of the ATP is that completion of the entire regional pedestrian and bicycle networks, so that they are connected and safe, should be a highthe highest priority and key focus of transportation improvements in the region. Focusing investments strategically to get the highest return on investment is important.
p. 99
Suggest using a US example at footer 86.
p. 109
8. Include education programs, encouragement programs and initiatives such as Bike Share and Safe Routes to School programs.
9. … Support high priority impact projects …
Appendix 4: Glossary of Selected Terms
Suggest including definition of Safe Routes to School, for example:
Safe Routes to School is a catalyst for the creation of safe, healthy and livable communities—urban, suburban

and rural—throughout the United States. Parents, school districts, local governments, police and community partners work together to ensure the safety of children on the trip to and from school. Safe Routes to School programs ensure that children of all abilities, income levels and cultures have traffic safety skills and regularly choose to walk and bicycle to school and in daily life. Safe Routes to School policies ensure that schools are sited near the children and parents they serve and that routes are safe for walking and bicycling. These shifts result in communities with less traffic congestion and air pollution as well as more physically active children and families.

In conclusion, we strongly support Metro's efforts to plan for a healthy, active and climate-friendly region through the creation of a Regional Active Transportation Plan that will augment and complement the goals of the Regional Transportation Plan, and we thank you for the opportunity to provide input. We also hope you will agree with us that active transportation projects and funding are incomplete without investment in Safe Routes to School as part of the active transportation network. We look forward to Metro's continued leadership to propel investments around the region that will drastically increase the number and diversity of people that have safe and convenient access to walking, bicycling, transit, and active transportation networks.

We look forward to continuing to work with you as the ATP moves forward toward adoption and implementation. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kari Schlosshauer
Pacific Northwest Regional Policy Manager
Safe Routes to School National Partnership

WASHINGTON COUNTY
OREGON

Memorandum

To: Lake McTighe, Active Transportation Project Manager, Metro

From: Steve Szigethy, Senior Planner

Date: November 1, 2013

Re: Suggestions for Regional Active Transportation Plan Chapter 11

Lake, thank you for hosting a very productive work group on Wednesday. Below are some suggestions for Chapter 11 – Design Guidelines in the draft Regional Active Transportation Plan, based on those discussions and some additional considerations from Washington County's perspective.

How the design guidelines will be used [This new section could appear somewhere on page 64 or 65]

The design guidelines in the ATP are intended to be used as a resource by local jurisdictions when they scope, design, construct, maintain and/or operate pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and when they create pedestrian and bicycle network concepts and project lists in transportation system plans. While local jurisdictions are strongly encouraged to meet these guidelines, they are not requirements. Federal or regional funds for a particular project will not be conditioned on meeting the guidelines. Metro will use the guidelines when reviewing local transportation actions in two primary contexts:

- When reviewing applications or nominations for MTIP or other funds, Metro may ask or condition local jurisdictions to *evaluate the feasibility* of building a facility using ATP design guidelines. Metro will not withhold or delay funds if the local jurisdiction finds that it is not practicable to meet the design guidelines.

- When reviewing local transportation plans or other transportation actions that require Metro review, Metro may provide suggestions that relate to the ATP design guidelines. This role may be codified in a 2018 update to the RTFP, in which the Pedestrian System Design and Bicycle System Design sections may be modified to require local jurisdictions to *acknowledge* ATP design standards when developing system elements and project lists.

Designing in constrained locations [This could take the place of or be blended with the *Interim pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements* subsection.]

The ATP recognizes that many, if not most, pedestrian and bicycle projects will occur in constrained environments with finite right-of-way and surrounded by buildings, structures, yards, parking areas, trees, vegetation and other features typical of a developed area. In addition, jurisdictions typically want to make the most of limited available funds, balancing optimal design with longer project extents and connectivity.

For these reasons, it may not be feasible or even desirable in some cases to construct a facility with maximized pedestrian or bicycle facility dimensions. Similarly, reallocation of roadway space may be very practical and desirable in certain circumstances and not so in other places – particularly areas with poor roadway connectivity and high vehicle volumes compared to capacity.

In constrained contexts, local jurisdictions are encouraged to evaluate the feasibility of implementing the ATP design guidelines and to consider trade-offs among modes, but ultimately to design facilities in a context-sensitive fashion that meets community goals, adheres to local design standards, and provides the best compromise for all users.

Freight and transit operational considerations [This could be one of two new subsections that would split the existing *Overlapping needs: wildlife habitat and freight* section. The other section could be called Wildlife habitat considerations.]

As shown in Figures __ and __, many of the recommended regional pedestrian and bicycle network elements overlap with freight routes and transit routes. When designing pedestrian and bicycle facilities on these routes, local jurisdictions must facilitate safe and reasonably efficient vehicle operations for freight trucks and transit vehicles along with safe and comfortable pedestrian and bicycle travel. Factors to consider include lane widths, paved area widths, buffering between large vehicles and people walking and cycling, visibility through these buffers, turning radii for large vehicles, horizontal and vertical clearance, and over-dimensional freight.

The region has several good examples where active transportation can be safely and comfortably accommodated along routes designated for freight movement and transit:

- N Marine Drive, Portland: 5-lane roadway, bike lanes, sidewalk on north side, multi-use path on south side
- Cornell Road in Orenco Station, Hillsboro: 4-lane roadway with median and trees, bike lanes, sidewalks with wide planter strips
- St Johns truck aprons / mountable curbs / pillows at intersections

From: Luke Pelz
To: Lake McTighe
Subject: RE: ATP Focus Group: Funding/Implementation Strategies & Projects
Date: Monday, December 02, 2013 12:19:54 PM
Attachments: image004.png

Hi Lake,

I'm following up on a few items:

- ATP Comments: I've reviewed the latest draft of the ATP and the workgroup summaries. I believe you are moving in the right direction to address the issues that have been raised by Margaret and other staff thus far. We have no additional recommended modifications to the ATP language at this time. We will have a formal letter of comment from city officials prior to May.
- Networks: I've completed a cursory review of the bike and pedestrian network and all looks good. If I find any discrepancies with Beaverton's TSP I'll let you know.
- We are waiting to hear back from the Mayor's Office regarding an ATP update to Council. At this point we are thinking that Councilor Harrington may want to provide an ATP update to the Beaverton City Council during her next visit. It would also be beneficial if you could attend to possibly answer some of the more technical questions. You both may wish to present however I'll leave that to you and Councilor Harrington. We will coordinate more on the details once I hear back from the Mayor's staff.

Regards,

Luke Pelz, AICP
Associate Transportation Planner | Community and Economic Development Department
City of Beaverton | PO Box 4755 | Beaverton OR 97076-4755
p: 503.526.2466 | f: 503.526.3720 | www.beavertonoregon.gov

From: Lake McTighe [mailto:Lake.McTighe@oregonmetro.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 13, 2013 1:54 PM
To: Luke Pelz
Subject: RE: ATP Focus Group: Funding/Implementation Strategies & Projects

Thanks Luke.

Please submit any comments or letters no later than Dec. 6, though if it is possible to get them to me earlier that would be great!

From: Lake McTighe
To: "Carol L. Chesarek"
Subject: RE: comments on the ATP, including Ch 9, 10, 11
Date: Monday, December 16, 2013 3:21:00 PM

Hi Carol,

Please see below!

Lake Strongheart McTighe
Project Manager
Active Transportation
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
503-797-1660
www.oregonmetro.gov/activetransport

Metro | Making a great place

Stay in touch with news, stories and things to do.
www.oregonmetro.gov/connect

From: Carol L. Chesarek [mailto:chesarek4nature@earthlink.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 7:47 AM
To: Lake McTighe
Subject: comments on the ATP, including Ch 9, 10, 11

Hi Lake,

I won't be able to attend today's ATP workgroup meeting, but I wanted to get my detailed comments on the document to you. These are for Review Draft 2.

Most (but not all) of these comments refer to material in Chapters 9, 10, and 11. I'm not sure how you'll want to use or respond to them, but thought I should get them to you before today's meeting.

Thanks for adding the references to the Regional Conservation Strategy, I appreciate your response to my previous comments.

p. 41, next to last bullet. What is a "diagonal route" ? It isn't defined here, it isn't obvious what it means, and the term isn't in the glossary.***[Lake McTighe]*** added explanation

p. 44. Reference to "North Washington suburbs." Washington State? Washington County? From the context (a list of areas within the Portland metropolitan region) I assume the

reference is to northern Washington county, but it would be nice to have a note in parenthesis to clarify this.***[Lake McTighe]*** Added the word County

p. 48, 1st line of text. Missing an "of," as in "network of off-street..."***[Lake McTighe]*** fixed

p. 60. The Pedestrian map still shows a Pedestrian Parkway on NW Kaiser Road from the county line to Germantown Road. This section of Pedestrian Parkway that extends beyond Washington County (North Bethany) and the UGB into rural Multnomah County (in a Rural Reserve) needs to be removed, and Project P13 description should replace "Germantown" with "county line" or "UGB." This pedestrian parkway is not on any Multnomah County plan, and Washington County should not be planning projects in Mult Co. ***[Lake McTighe]*** Corrected – see earlier email

p. 67 & 68. Functional Class Definitions and Preferred Design Guildelines. Please add "topographical and environmental constraints" to the list of context considerations for doing adaptive design. ***[Lake McTighe]*** added. This whole chapter has been overhauled based on input from the WorkGroup; I have worked in all of your suggestions for wording though they will not always be in the original areas due to reorganization. I added this suggestion to a new bulleted list under the heading Importance of context in design"

p. 71. 1st & 2nd lines. "(Where) there are significant physical constraints, such as steep slopes, landslide hazards, or regionally significant lands or riparian areas..." Please replace "regionally significant lands" (what are these?) with "regionally significant natural features" (which were defined for the Urban and Rural Reserves process, check with Tim O'Brien for info). A reference to "high value natural resource lands" identified in the Regional Conservation Strategy (Jonathan Soll would be a good reference for this approach) would also be acceptible. ***[Lake McTighe]*** updated and used high quality land and riparian areas to be consistent with the RCS

p. 71, next to last sentence. Consider replacing "Sensitive" with "High value." ***[Lake McTighe]*** replaced

p. 71. last sentence, 1st bullet. "Design should be usd to enhance watershed and ecosystem health and mitigate and reduce impacts." Please remove "Sensitive" (which is a repeated word from the previous sentence, and which while well intended has no real meaning here), and add "wildlife crossings," after ecosystem health.***[Lake McTighe]*** done

p. 72. next to last sentence, 2nd paragraph. "Wildlife crossing treatments can be considered at key animal routes or culverts." Please consider changing this to read "Wildlife crossing treatments should be considered at key wildlife crossings or riparian corridors." Lori Hennings is Metro's expert on wildlife crossings, you could consult with her about appropriate wording. "Can" is much weaker that "should." Riparian corridors are important regardless of whether there is an existing culvert or bridge or other structure.***[Lake McTighe]*** incorporated changes, used word should. This is in the section called "Wildlife, habitat and riparian considerations"

p. 72, resource list. Consider adding to the resource list one of Metro's Wildlife Crossings booklets ("Wildlife crossings: Providing safe passage for urban wildlife" or the more recent "Wildlife corridors and permeability, A literature review"). Lori Hennings is the author. The booklet isn't available online due to Federal restrictions, but free copies area available on request. See http://www.oregonmetro.gov/index.cfm/go/by.web/id=38104 for information. ***[Lake McTighe]*** Added

Also, in your Sept 11 RTP policy and map changes memo, Attachment 1, page 7 (ATP Recommended Changes to Ch. 2). 4th paragraph, 7th line. "pedestrian and bicycle crossings can include improved crossings for wildlife." Change to "pedestrian and bicycle projects can

include" -- ped and bike crossings should not be the only projects where wildlife crossings are considered. I haven't seen the Metro Green Streets booklet on stormwater and stream crossings, but the online description doesn't mention wildlife crossings so you might want to add a referece to the Wildlife Crossings booklet here too.***[Lake McTighe]*** changed and added the wildlife crossings book

Please let me know if you have questions.

Thanks!

Carol

From: Lake McTighe
To: Lori Hennings
Cc: Jonathan Soll; Robert Spurlock; John Williams; Elaine Stewart
Subject: RE: ATP wildlife, habitat and riparian considerations
Date: Friday, December 20, 2013 1:18:00 PM

Lori I incorporated all of your comments.

Thanks again for the feedback and happy holidays to you!

Lake Strongheart McTighe
Project Manager
Active Transportation
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
503-797-1660
www.oregonmetro.gov/activetransport

Metro | Making a great place

Stay in touch with news, stories and things to do.
www.oregonmetro.gov/connect

From: Lori Hennings
Sent: Friday, December 20, 2013 12:29 PM
To: Lake McTighe
Cc: Jonathan Soll; Robert Spurlock; John Williams; Elaine Stewart
Subject: RE: ATP wildlife, habitat and riparian considerations

Lake,

Thank you so much for inviting our comments. Mine are attached. We will have a semi-final draft of "top 10 natural resource considerations" in January, finalized by February (still has to go through internal review). I attached the draft that went out for external review as an FYI.

Lori Hennings
Senior Natural Resource Scientist

Metro
600 NE Grand Ave

Wildlife, habitat and riparian considerations

As with all transportation projects, impacts to wildlife, habitat and the environment need to be considered when planning, designing and implementing bicycling and pedestrian facilities. Trails especially can intersect with areas of high quality land and riparian areas.

Bicycle and pedestrian projects can sometimes provide opportunities to benefit wildlife, habitat, and water quality, by replacing a culvert, adding a wildlife crossing or providing new vegetation. These types of opportunities should be looked for and included in projects when possible.

Where there are significant physical of environmental constraints, such as steep slopes, landslide hazards, or high value natural resource lands and/or riparian areas, identifying alternative routes may be appropriate. The maps included in this chapter illustrate the location of high quality land and riparian areas and the regional active transportation networks. High value habitats and resources, such as wetlands, should be avoided as much as possible.

Active transportation and impacts to wildlife must be carefully balanced. Some impacts can be mitigated with design treatments. For example, pervious pavement can be used to reduce water runoff. Wildlife crossing treatments can be considered at key animal routes or at culverts. In other instances avoiding the habitat altogether is necessary.

Resources for planning and developing environmentally sensitive and habitat friendly trails and other pedestrian and bicycle projects should be utilized throughout the planning process. Additionally, experts such as conservation scientists, biologists and ecologists should be consulted early on in the planning process to identify ways in which trail development can also provide opportunities for restoration, enhancing watershed and ecosystem health, or wildlife crossings and to ensure that high quality lands and riparian areas are protected.

Resources for planning and developing environmentally sensitive and habitat friendly trails

- Green Trails: Guidelines for environmentally friendly trails. Metro.
- Planning Trails with Wildlife in Mind: A handbook for trail planners. Colorado State Parks.
- For regional data, Regional Conservation Strategy for the Greater Portland Vancouver Metropolitan Area. Intertwine and Metro.
- For local planning, resources such as Title 13, local wetland inventories, and local tree cover maps are useful.

The following two maps show areas with high quality land and riparian areas that intersect with the recommended regional pedestrian and bicycle networks.

Hi Lake,

In reviewing the draft Regional Active Transportation Plan, we found that the document generally does a good job of addressing equity. We appreciate the attention and focus on the needs of underserved populations and other equity considerations.

We drafted up edits to strengthen and clarify some language, and to increase consistency through the document. These edits are based on our own expertise and on documents that have been fundamental in shaping the transportation equity discussion: North American Sustainable Transportation Council's STARS Health Equity Assessment Tool, Multnomah County's Action Plan for an Age-Friendly Portland, Urban League's Racial Equity Strategy Guide, and Upstream Public Health's Transportation Health Equity Principles.

The edits are attached (as well as a map that we reference in the edits). If you have any questions, please feel free to contact either myself or Mara Gross. Thank you for taking our comments and proposed edits into consideration.

Best,

Scotty Ellis

Scotty Ellis, Outreach Coordinator
503.294.2889 • scotty@clfuture.org
Coalition for a Livable Future

A major research and education project, the Regional Equity Atlas promotes widespread opportunity for a stronger, healthier, and more sustainable region.

ATP Proposed Edits – Coalition for a Livable Future

- **Page 7 – "Investing in active transportation shapes our region in ways we all care about:"**
  - Insert a new bullet – "It increases access to jobs." Added
- **Page 9 – "The region's planned pedestrian and bicycle networks have major gaps. These gaps impact safety and discourage people from choosing to walk, ride a bike or take transit. Many people would like to walk and ride bicycles more for transportation, but feel unsafe doing so. The fears are justified; serious pedestrian and bicycle crashes account for 20% of all serious crashes in the region. Pedestrian and bicycle crash rates are higher than their share of trips."**
  - Insert at the end of the paragraph– "According to Transportation for America's report, Dangerous by Design, children, older adults, and racial and ethnic minorities experience disproportionately high fatality rates from pedestrian crashes." Added
    - **Citation:** Transportation for America. (2011). Dangerous by Design. Available at: http://www.aarp.org/content/dam/aarp/livable-communities/learn/transportation/dangerous-by-design-2011-aarp.pdf
- **Page 11 – "Opportunities to expand active transportation"**
  - Insert new bullet – "Increase opportunities to access local and essential resources for areas and populations that have experienced historical underinvestment." Added with this additional text: Completing pedestrian, transit and bicycle networks and connecting them to essential destinations in areas with higher concentrations of environmental justice and underserved communities and where less investment has occurred in the past will help complete the regional active transpiration network and help reduce driving.
- **Page 18 – Chapter 2. Benefits of Active Transportation**
  - Insert new bullet – "**Investing in the active transportation network supports active aging and aging in place.** Research shows that after the age of 55, less than five percent of Americans will change residences. This means thousands of older adults throughout our region are aging in place. As our older populations cease to drive, accessible active transportation alternatives become essential in supporting these individuals in accessing resources, facilitating social connections, and staying active." Added
    - **Citation:** Frey, William H. (2007), "Mapping the Growth of Older America: Seniors and Boomers in the Early 21st Century." The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

- **Page 19 – Chapter 2. Benefits of Active Transportation**

  - Image insertion – Inclusion of Equity Atlas map showing higher obesity rates in areas where the bicycle and pedestrian networks are less complete (see attached image).

Comment [LSM1]: Do you have a higher resolution image? The detail is lost/hard to read.

- **Page 21 – Chapter 2. Benefits of Active Transportation**

  - Edit first bullet – "Investing in the active transportation network increases access to destinations. New connections in the regional pedestrian network would substantially increase the number of people that are within a safe and protected 1 mile walk of transit, jobs, parks, food, civic, health, and retail locations. The recommend regional bicycle network contains 60% greater network mileage than the current network. The increased network density and connectivity will put more people in the region within access of destinations. Improving the pedestrian and bicycle networks to allow for convenient biking and walking access to transit increases access to destinations." Added

- **Page 22 – Chapter 2. Benefits of Active Transportation**

  - Typo in first bullet – "Investing in the active transportation network supports tourism, jobs and industry in the region. Providing active transportation infrastructure has been identified as a crucial element to attracting a skilled and quality workforce to the region. In Portland, 68% of businesses involved in the SmartTrips Business program said that promoting biking and walking helped them market their business. A study of several different communities in the region, both urban and suburban, ~~found that~~ found that while car drivers spend more at supermarkets and restaurants than the other transport modes, walkers, bikers, and public transport users visit the locations more frequently, and thus, over the space of a month, spend more. And, the region benefits from $89 million a year in bicycle related tourism." Fixed

  - Edit last bullet – "Investing in the active transportation network increases transportation choices. Completion of the recommended regional pedestrian and bicycle networks would increase transportation choices, including the choice of taking transit, walking, and biking ~~for transportation~~ for many more people in the region. Seventy-five percent of respondents to an Opt-In poll indicated that more dedicated bicycle lanes would encourage bicycle riding for transportation on a more frequent basis." Change made

- **Page 23 – "Are there negative impacts associated with active transportation?"**

  - Insert new bullet – "**Increase in pedestrian and bicycle networks may be counter to community priorities.** In order to insure that the implementation of new sidewalks or bicycle facilities is in alignment with community priorities, impacted communities

should be engaged from the early stages of planning, with real opportunities to influence decision-making." Added with this text (heading has been changed to "Challenges"): ncrease in pedestrian and bicycle networks may not be a community's highest priority. In order to insure that the implementation of new sidewalks or bicycle facilities are in alignment with community priorities, impacted communities should be engaged from the early stages of planning, with real opportunities to influence decision-making.

- **Page 28 – Chapter 3: Findings and Opportunities**

  - Edit finding "f"– "People with disabilities rely on transit and walking more than people without disabilities. Nearly 7% of the population reports having a disability that affects their ability to travel. People with disabilities particularly rely on transit for travel. Access to transit for individuals with mobility impairments is hindered by incomplete pedestrian and curb cut networks." Added with slight change in wording.

- **Page 35 – Chapter 5: Vision for 2035**

  - Edit vision: "In 2035, convenient and safe access to active transportation has helped create and maintain vibrant communities in the region. Connected and safe pedestrian, bicycle and transit networks provide transportation choices throughout the region. People of all ages, abilities, income levels and backgrounds can walk and bike easily and safely for many of their daily needs and the walking and bicycling environment is welcoming to them. A majority of the short trips in the region are made by bicycling and walking. Children enjoy independence walking and biking to school and elders are aging in place and can get around easily without a car. Active transportation contributes significantly to the region's economic prosperity. Household transportation costs are lowered, roadways are less congested and freight experiences less delay. People enjoy clean air and water, and are healthier and happier because they were meaningfully involved in active transportation decisions that affect them and can incorporate physical activity into their daily routines ~~they are healthier and happier~~."

Added with this text: *In 2035, people across the region have been meaningfully involved to create a transportation system that meets their needs. Convenient and safe access to active transportation has helped create and maintain vibrant communities in the region. Connected and safe pedestrian, bicycle and transit networks provide transportation choices throughout the region. People of all ages, abilities, income levels and backgrounds can walk and bike easily and safely for many of their daily needs and the walking and bicycling environment is welcoming to them. A majority of the short trips in the region are made by bicycling and walking. Children enjoy independence walking and biking to school and elders are aging in place and can get around easily without a car. Active transportation contributes significantly to the region's*

economic prosperity. Household transportation costs are lowered, roadways are less congested and freight experiences less delay. People enjoy clean air and water and are healthier and happier because they incorporate physical activity into their daily routines.

- **Page 71 – Chapter 12: Policy Recommendations**
  - Edits to Policy 1.2: "Work with jurisdictions, agencies and stakeholders to identify and encourage the implementation of projects that connect people to destinations that serve essential daily needs, including schools, jobs, parks and nature, transit, services and urban centers, especially in areas that support underserved communities and where there is a high level of demand for walking, bicycling and transit service." Added with slight change in wording order
  - Edits to Policy 2 title: "Policy 2. Develop a well-connected regional network of complete streets and off- street paths integrated with transit and nature, and prioritizing safe, convenient, accessible, and comfortable pedestrian and bicycle access for all ages and abilities." added
- **Page 77 – Chapter 13: Modal Targets and Performance Measures**
  - Insert additional proposed performance measure – "Increase in sidewalk density in areas with above regional average percent communities of color, populations in poverty, seniors, and youth."
  - Insert additional proposed performance measure – "Increase in % of bicycle network in areas with above regional average percent communities of color, populations in poverty, seniors, and youth."

    We are working on the performance measures. Need to work with staff on this to determine how it will be measured.
- **General Comments**
  - The following terms are inconsistently used throughout the document. Will use these terms, unless others are recommended:
    - Seniors ~~vs. elders/elderly~~
    - People of color ~~vs. minority~~ communities of color
    - ~~Low English proficiency vs. non-English speaking~~limited English proficiency
    - ~~Children vs.~~ youth

- Low income
- Persons with disabilities

○ Edit the definition of Underserved Communities to include : Changes made

- "*Underserved communities – Populations that have historically experienced a lack of consideration in the planning and decision making process. It describes communities of concern in addition to those that are ~~not specifically called out~~ defined in the federal definition of Environmental Justice. These populations are ~~elderly~~ seniors, persons with disabilities, youth ~~children~~, communities of color, low-income communities, and any other population of people whose needs may not have been full met in the planning process.

From: RAHMAN Lidwien [mailto:Lidwien.RAHMAN@odot.state.or.us]
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 3:15 PM
To: Lake McTighe
Subject: RE: First meeting: Regional Workgroup: Active Transportation Plan/RTP

Here are some quick comments on Review Draft 2:

Page 16:
I think the description of the regional versus local network still needs some more work, and will be a good topic for the Work Group to discuss. We should be clear whether the regional networks (which include bicycle and pedestrian districts in 2040 mixed use centers) include all of the local networks, or only what is on the network maps, and specifically whether local network improvements not on the regional network are eligible for regional funding. In the future, the Regional Transportation Functional Plan should be amended to give clear direction that local systems must be consistent with the regional system, i.e. they cannot be less than the regional system, but they can have more, local elements.

Page 17:
Last sentence ",,, knitting these plans together in a way that will support…"

Page 18: How does the ATP move forward? This might be a good place to clarify what will be adopted into the RTP itself by ordinance, and what will be adopted by resolution as a stand-alone modal plan.

Page 25: "Road diets typically reduce the number of lanes from an even number…"

Page 40: Regional Bicycle Network Evaluation: "Various potential improvements…" (same comment for Regional Pedestrian Network Evaluation on page 42). "… the impact of additional projects and improvements listed (not "programmed" – the RTP does not program funds) in the 2035 RTP project list." By the way, did the evaluation include all 2035 RTP bike/ped projects or only those on the regional bike/ped networks?

Page 42: "Top pedestrian districts in terms of increased access to the most people…"

Page 43: "… Hillsboro, which h scores low in the increased access metric…" same in next bullet. There is a difference between absolute accessibility and increased access. Note 51 – delete the word "yet".

Page 48, How were the routes identified? "…approximately 150 miles of roadways were added rather than identified? I think what you are trying to say is 225 miles of new routes were added, of which 150 added miles on roadways and 70 miles of new trails; correct?

Page 61: Pedestrian Districts. Modify the statement that Pedestrian Districts are those *currently* identified on the 2035 RTP Ped Network Map to clarify that we added a bunch of Station Communities along the Portland Milwaukie and Portland Clackamas LRT lines.

Page 65: delete or modify the last sentence about interim improvements being a last resort and not a default approach. In my opinion, the next step for the RATP is not construction, but system level decisions on the ultimate preferred = planned facilities in local TSPs – which may be a separated bikeway or sidewalk, or a parallel neighborhood bikeway, or a trail. The TSPs should have an implementation plan, which may include interim facilities, and a funding strategy. The TSPs should make a determination of whether it is more important to fill gaps in the "basic" network or to upgrade existing facilities to the ultimate design. An additional consideration for whether to go with an interim or ultimate design is how old the roadway is and how long it has been since it was (re)constructed. For example, many of the

arterials in Washington County are new with sidewalks and bikelanes. The County is not likely to tear those up anytime soon to add buffered bikelanes. It would be good to add a few sentences about the interim approach including ROW dedication or setbacks for the ultimate facility as part of development and plan amendment review.

Page 77: I recommend adding more meat to the statement "Metro actions to implement policy", i.e. that local jurisdictions will not be expected to implement these actions. Now that you have drafted the subset of policies to go into the RTP itself, you should explain in Chapter 12 how the RATP Policies and Actions relate to the RTP Policies and Actions (including the distinction between RTP adoption by Ordinance versus RATP adoption by Resolution). Action 1.6: the definition of short trips should be part of the policy, not buried in one of the actions.

Page 83-86: Note that there are two different sets of regional targets relative to active transportation: the mode split targets in Table 2.3 and the non-SOV targets in Table 2.5. The difference is that Table 2.5 includes carpool/shared ride as well as bike/ped/transit, and sets absolute targets rather than % increase . You should add a discussion of the non-SOV mode split targets to this chapter.

Page 89: ".. and over 20% of all funding for other regional pedestrian and bicycle projects."
Page 90: I would delete "Bicycle and Pedestrian District development" from the list of examples appropriate for large federal funding opportunities. Regarding the ODOT Fix It funds –filling in missing sidewalks and bikelanes is not currently considered eligible for Fix It funding. Clarify that this would require a change in policy and practice.
Page 92 top line: "Metro and THPRD have (not "has") passed bond measures…".
Page 92, Local Sources: delete "include" before SDCs, and correct spelling of "identified". "The development community ….. improvements in the form of/through conditions of approval, right-of-way dedication, and frontage improvements…"

Page 95 – stand-alone versus multimodal projects: maybe add a sentence about the need for different funding and implementation strategies between urban and urbanizing areas – retrofitting existing streets in a built up setting requires a different approach from urbanizing areas where new local roads are being built as part of new subdivisions and arterials are being upgraded from rural to urban multi-modal cross-sections. Also, add a sentence about not knowing the value of bike/ped improvements provided by developers through frontage improvements.

Page 98: Overall recommended approach: clarify what you mean by "completion" – filling gaps, or building to the preferred design standard?

Page 99, bullet # 3: the bullet gives priority to places that *increase* access for the most people and *increase* levels of walking. The first three bulleted list seems to be of areas with high levels of bicycling, i.e. not with the greatest increase but with the greatest absolute number. I like having the lists in this section but the connection between the strategy and the lists should be a little more clear. Footnote 86 – it seems silly to add such a specific footnote. Hundreds of suburbs in Germany, Holland, and Scandinavia are routinely being built for all modes.

Page 112, MPAC: delete "and thus the ATP". The current strategy is not to adopt the ATP as a land use action, i.e. by ordinance.

Lidwien

Design Guidelines comments
Hillsboro (Jeannine Rustad) For Lake

Design guidelines

- Needs to be clear that context sensitivity is paramount – whether it's environmental constraints or the built environment
- Should not be tied to funding – if all else equal between two applications, may be weighed in decision.
- If region determines guidelines should be criteria for RFF funds – context sensitivity needs to be somehow factored in to the process. It can't be a simple "yes/no" whether or how many guidelines are met.
- I liked the suggestion of having examples of how guidelines could be modified given different scenarios.

General comments

- Caution and explanation is needed when suggestion "road diets" (page 71 of redlined version). This is not a popular subject/mechanism in Washington County, and for good reason. Washington County does not have the grid network of Portland, nor the benefit of 405/205 as alternate routes. Road networks are constrained by stream corridors and wetlands.
- Page 52 (track-changed version) – mentions that "*bus stops with high ridership could also be considered as potential Bicycle Districts.*" Do they mean to say that the bus stops and surrounding/supporting land uses should be designated, not just the bus stop? Are these areas better designated under the local bikeway systems (p.56)?
- Importance of freight – need to prioritize freight on designated freight routes and look for alternative roads in those areas for bikes/peds, especially where there is constraints due to built environment or environmentally sensitive features. Page 70- should be clear that additional work referenced here be completed before conflicting areas are incorporated in the plan.

e.g. TV Hwy

Multnomah County comments for Regional Active Transportation Plan Review Draft 3

January 21, 2014

Notes prepared by Kate McQuillan, Transportation Planner

General Comments:

- I'd recommend really clarifying what you want to be the key take-away messages and products from the ATP. Knowing that would really help refine the whole document. I think, generally speaking, there is redundant information throughout various sections and combined with the previous Plan documents (which could simply be referred to). However it is difficult to recommend which sections to thin out without knowing the key points of the plan.
- Possibly merge Chapters 4 and 5? (ATP Vision and Guiding Principles). Generally speaking, there are a lot of chapters. The sheer # of chapters make the long document appear even longer than it is.
- Swap Chapters 6 & 7 (or merge into one chapter). Chapter 7 introduces the concept of the networks where as Chapter 6 gets into the results and criteria.
- Changes to Chapter 10 (Design Guidance) are great. Thank you! I like how the Chapter is now organized by facility vs. the previous matrix. Although I would like to echo a comment from the 1/16/14 Working Group meeting to strengthen the language in this chapter that the Parkway classifications at the top of the hierarchy should strive to achieve greater separation and best practices than the 'lesser' classifications.

(Comments are organized by page # from the track changes version of Review Draft 3)

Page 7 – When recognizing the cities/counties/partners, is it possible to include logos? The page seems bare.

Pages 10-20 (Executive Summary) – Needs a little more tweaking.

- Use the Exec Summary to tell a story and to entice the reader to keep reading to find out more. Also keep very condense (maybe 2-3 pages)
- I don't recommend swapping Intro with Exec Summary as discussed in the 1/16/14 Working Group meeting.
- Omit the first paragraph (better suited for the Introduction)
- Move the italicized text for the "Vision" before the Region's adopted six desired outcomes. Omit the graphic/call out of six outcomes.
- Omit the "Values" subsection (better suited for the Introduction)
- Italicize the key points in the Challenges similar to Opportunities
- Each bullet point under the Opportunities could probably be shortened and condensed a little bit
- Wrap up the Exec Summary by relating back to the key take-away messages of the ATP (the Implementation Strategies?)

Page 21 – For first paragraph of Introduction, I prefer the first paragraph of current Executive Summary (page 10) that begins with "The need for an ATP…". I like that background and historical information.

Page 21 – Graphically call out the definition of "active transportation". Aesthetically it could help break up the page and it would also be easier for readers to refer back to if needed. Example of a good call out graphic is page 43 ("Health Connection").

Page 21 – After the introductory paragraph with the history, reiterate the key take away messages of the ATP (ATP is a plan, a set of policies, and a vision, etc).

Page 24 – The subsection, "The ATP Network Defined" – move before the chapter descriptions. As is, it gets lost. Also, in this subsection, define and clarify what the network concept is. The subsection just starts discussing the networks without any sort of introduction as being a key outcome and product of the ATP. The network concept loses its significance.

Page 25 – Prior to concept that local networks are to be consistent with the regional network (second paragraph in), clearly state that the ATP network will be adopted into the Regional Transportation Plan as policy. Thus, local networks will need to be consistent. This critical relationship is lost with current language.

Page 26 – I love the concept of having Community Profiles. Would they make more sense in another location in the document? Maybe a separate chapter after Design Guidance or as a separate appendix?

Page 41 – The subsection "Implementation of the ATP" seems oddly placed. I think it could be omitted entirely since there is an entire chapter devoted to implementation. Also, there is a discrepancy in the messaging with this subsection vs. the implementation chapter. This subsection states that "local jurisdictions and agencies are primarily responsible for implementing the pedestrian and bicycle networks"; whereas Chapter 15 (page 166) states, "Implementation strategies outlined below are intended to be implemented by Metro" and some of the strategies get at implementing the networks. The two statements are contradictory. There is general confusion through the document on the ATP hopes to achieve and how it will happen.

Page 55 – Chapter 3 – I think it would be appropriate to have Metro's "Six Desired Outcomes" here (instead of Exec Summary)

Page 64 – The process for evaluating and choosing the preferred bicycle and pedestrian networks is confusing (even for me who sat on the SAC). In general, I think the process for choosing a network concept and then evaluating the magnitude of impacts when improving the networks needs to be much more transparent.

- What happened to evaluating network concept? Didn't we look at grid vs spiderweb vs radial? If that wasn't a fruitful exercise, then how did we end up with the network we did? Was the existing RTP network assumed to be the foundation? I thought I read elsewhere in the plan that there was a desire for a regional bicycle parkway every two miles – where that did come from? Who decided that?
- The whole process could greatly benefit from graphic representation / flow chart. I've heard this feedback from my senior staff and managers as well.
- This is also why it would make sense to swap Chapter 6 and 7, as Chapter 7 does provide a little more information on the networks before jumping into the evaluation of them.

Page 64 – Flush out the analysis reports a little more. Ie., what was the intent of the reports, their general outcomes and findings, the process for them, etc.

Page 65 – Just prior to the bullet points, I'd recommend a subtitle as an introduction and for easier scanning.

Pages 65 – 67 – Could the sub-bullet points (the geographic areas) be reformatted for easier reading? Like a table? The long lists of bullet points become difficult to follow and read.

Page 71 – In the introduction of Chapter 7, which introduces the concept of the ATP network, add some language similar to the Introduction chapter which directly relates ATP network to future policies to build out the ATP vision.

Page 77 - Really highlight that the ATP creates a new bicycle functional classification system. This is a major highlight and product of the ATP. Refer to the following section (page 81) which describes the functional classes further.

Pages 78 – 79 – First paragraph in the subsection of "Regional Bicycle Network Concept" - I think you could omit the first paragraph entirely and begin with the paragraph, "Three separate bicycle network concepts were developed…". I'd recommend changing the subtitle to "Network Concept Development" and move before previous subsection (titled "Updating the regional bicycle network map"). Also, a few sentences in "Updating the regional bicycle network map" about developing the bicycle networks could be omitted for being redundant.

Page 89 – (Like the comment for page 77) Really highlight that the ATP creates a new pedestrian functional classification system. This is a major outcome of the ATP.

Page 90 – In the subsection, "Regional pedestrian network concept" there is no mention of how the concept was developed. How was it? The previous sections on the bicycle network discuss network evaluation and the evaluation analysis reports. What about the pedestrian network analysis?? Also, similar to comments for pages 78-79, I'd recommend putting this subsection prior to the previous subsection (titled, "Updating the pedestrian network map").

Page 100 – I'd like to reiterate a statement heard at the 1/16/14 Working Group meeting about making "Encourage best practices" as the #1 purpose of the ATP design guidance.

Page 103 – In the first bullet point, change "anticipated level of bicycle and pedestrian activity" to "planned level of …". It would not only be consistent with a bullet point further down but the word "planned" gets at the desired activity assumed in policies and current functional classification (where are "anticipated" is a little too ambiguous).

Page 108 and 111 – Building upon an idea heard at the 1/16/14 Working Group meeting, I'd recommend adding under "Design elements for all regional bicycle/pedestrian routes and bicycle/pedestrian districts" a public outreach and marketing campaign so that the public learns (a) the significance of the regional parkways and (b) how to find them. (I believe the example brought up was Copenhagen invested in a massive marketing campaign to be sure the public knew about the regional bike superhighways)

Page 122 – In the call out titled, "Top 10 Natural Resource Considerations for Trails", I'd recommend changing the language in point #1 to say, "Engage natural resource experts/professionals…" instead of consultants.

Page 123 – Is there a preview of this map (overlaying the Regional Conservation Strategy with the ATP networks)?

Page 125 – Is the last word of the 2nd paragraph supposed to be "RTP" instead of "ATP"?

Page 133 / Chapter 12 – I'm not a fan of the Chapter title. The title is confusing and doesn't say what the chapter is about. Maybe call it, "Policy Findings"?

Page 141 – 1st and 3rd paragraphs – Clarify in the language how the ATP policies update the RTP. Be very explicit. Are the ATP policies to be directly adopted into the RTP? Or will the RTP policies be independently edited to reflect the 'spirit and intent' of the ATP policies?

Page 153 – Confusing organization with the funding chapter. I think the subtitle halfway down the page ("Aligning projects with existing funding opportunities") is confusing and not correct. Maybe retitle the subsection, "Existing funding opportunities".

Page 155 – Item #6 – Not sure if it is appropriate to mention a regional active transportation fund without any other details or discussion. Perhaps you could vaguely mention the possibility of creating new funds in the future; Otherwise is too presumptive. May not sit well politically.

Page 156 – What is a "need rate"?

Page 157 – Subtitle doesn't seem accurate. Maybe rename it as "Cost assumptions"?

Page 157 – Last paragraph, clarify where the $ figures are coming from. I think it means numbers taken directly from the RTP project list but it is not clear. Also clarify where the planning level estimates come from. I think you get at it with footnotes for Table 6 on page 159, but that information could be referenced on page 157 to avoid confusion.

Page 160, Footnote #127- Does this also reference Appendix 2? Need to clarify.

Page 161 – First sentence in second paragraph – Would it be possible to bold this statement or even repeat it in a call out? It is a significant finding.

Page 162 – Second paragraph – Could you clarify if the ATP maintenance costs are portions of the overall street maintenance costs, or are they in addition to existing street maintenance costs?

Page 162 – The title for Table 7 – Add the word "Existing". Without the clarification, the difference between Tables 7 and 8 are confusing.

Page 163 – Alter the subtitle, "ATP network status – completed, gaps, and deficiencies". Perhaps, "Current ATP network conditions"?

Page 165 – I don't agree with the statement that, "… the region has not yet prioritized regional bicycle and pedestrian projects" (2nd paragraph). The RTP project list is our regional priorities, and the ATP has and will continue to inform the RTP project list. Plus the ATP also establishes the network with the highest classifications which creates a policy framework of priorities, and there are policy statements and implementation strategies that prioritize filling of gaps, completing networks where there will be greatest impact, completing networks with most underserved communities, etc. All of those combined get at regional priorities. Arguably the remaining pieces of deciding what specific projects to prioritize for others when funding comes along should stay at the local (sub-regional) level as they'd take into account all the other factors just mentioned.

Page 165 – Last sentence of second paragraph – I'd change the wording of, "may be desirable" to "may help". The phrase "desirable" sounds like a value judgment where as "may help" would change the tone to say further prioritization could be a useful tool.

Page 166 – Very first sentence – Edit to say, "To the greatest extent possible and when feasible, facilities should follow <u>best design practices (see Chapter 10 Design Guidance or Appendix XYZ for list of design resources)</u>. "

Page1 66 – See comment for Page 41 re: who implements what in the ATP.

Page 166 – 167 – The language leading into the bulleted strategies on what the evaluation actually evaluated is confusing. For the last paragraph on Page 166, after "The ATP evaluated improvements to the regional networks…"… Evaluated what specifically though? I think you're trying to say evaluated the magnitude of impacts / benefits of a complete network? It is not clear what exactly is being evaluated and for what purpose.

Page 167 – I'd re-add the word "Recommended" to the subtitle

Page 168 – 169 – Is there a better way to format instead of the very long bullet lists? The bullet lists distract from the very critical section of recommended implementation strategies. Can they be condensed into a table at the end of the section (or in an Appendix and then referenced)?

Page 169 – Would it be possible to refer to a map? There are many questions about the extents of the projects. For example, when I see the "Hogan Rd, East Multnomah County" area listed on the bulleted list, I wonder what the end points are- does it include NE 238th Drive or not? I have a lot of those questions throughout the bulleted lists so referencing a database or map that would have that information would be helpful.

Page 170 – 173 – Format to mirror the bicycle list (whichever format is chosen). As is, the pedestrian bullet points begin with Trails, where as the bicycle bullet points begin with Areas.

From: Lake McTighe
To: "Geller, Roger"
Cc: Hillier, Robert; Bower, Dan
Subject: RE: Suggested edits to ATP Draft Plan
Date: Tuesday, January 21, 2014 4:00:00 PM

Roger,

Thanks again for your comments. All of your suggestions have been incorporated into Review Draft 3, except for your recommendation to remove Table 2 from page 126. There needs to be more discussion around this. I agree with your assessment, however this is the baseline data that Metro is currently using to measure progress towards achieving the target. I've added some caveat language for now. I am going to put together a discussion of the performance targets and measures – this will be a topic. See the suggested text below. Let me know if you have some suggestions for how to frame the analysis that you did projecting mode shares for Portland.

And, on your comment on page 165, I added a sentence to the gap filling priority to get at your point: Areas where a high demand for walking and bicycling and transit use exist should be prioritized first. In instances where pedestrian and bicycle levels and demand exceed the capacity of an existing facility and impact safety, deficient facilities should be considered gaps and prioritized.

See below for specific responses to some of your suggestions.

Thanks again,
Lake

From: Geller, Roger [mailto:Roger.Geller@portlandoregon.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2014 4:33 PM
To: Lake McTighe
Cc: Hillier, Robert; Bower, Dan
Subject: Suggested edits to ATP Draft Plan

Lake,

Thanks for running a very good, effective meeting today. I agree: it is a really good group that is working well together. As I mentioned to you, you are very close with a really nice plan that seems to have universal agreement (at least among people showing up). Nice work!

Below are some specific comments I have for the draft plan. They range from the grammatical ("add a question mark") to the substantive.

p.12: replace "…active transportation as a ~~real~~ transportation option…" with, "…active transportation as a more frequently used transportation option…"
It already is "real."

p.17: "…23 more Powell Boulevards to accommodate the increase in auto traffic generated by Portland residents alone.

p. 21 Definition of Active Transportation. Do not include transit in the definition, as that muddies the waters. If this is an Active Transportation Plan and we define transit as active

transportation, then shouldn't this plan also include transit planning? I like the definition we previously used that defined active transportation as walking, bicycling and accessing transit by those modes.

[Lake McTighe] I've replaced the definition with this: Active transportation is human-powered transportation that engages people in healthy physical activity while they travel from place to place. Walking, the use of strollers, wheelchairs and mobility devices, skateboarding, bicycling and rollerblading are included active transportation.

Walkable and bikeable communities are places where it is easy and comfortable to make an active trip. Streets are connected and integrated with walking and biking trails and paths; safe crossings of busy streets, directional signs making it easy to navigate, and a pleasant environment with places to go and things to do, including access to nature all contribute to places where active transportation thrives.

Active transportation supports public transportation because most trips on public transportation include walking or bicycling. The ATP focuses on increasing pedestrian and bicycle access to transit, making it safer and more comfortable and supporting transit ridership by improving conditions for walking and bicycling near transit stops and stations. The ATP does not plan new or different transit routes; include funding recommendations for building or operating transit or identify deficiencies and recommend transit frequency improvement areas or routes.
For brevity, the terms active transportation and "bicycling and walking" will be used throughout this report and are intended to include all active modes. Throughout the document the terms active transportation, walking and bicycling will be used for brevity.

p. 44: "Research shows that after the age of 55, ~~less~~ fewer than five percent…" I believe "fewer" the more grammatically correct word because you're referring to something countable, but I'm not entirely sure.

p. 50: Change "…in alignment with community priorities, ~~impacted~~ communities should…" to "in alignment with community priorities, communities being considered for active transportation improvements should…" "Impacted" has a negative connotation ("The community is going to be impacted by the toxic plume of chlorine gas should the tanker car overturn.")

p. 63: Based on today's conversation, perhaps change title of Chapter 6 to "Identifying Recommended ATP Networks and Prioritizing Implementation" with a subtitle: "Criteria used to identify recommended classifications and for evaluating implementation priorities." I know this is clunky but this chapter is describing two different things: 1) how the ATP classifications in the plan were identified and how their implementation is to be prioritized. There seemed to be confusion over this at the meeting today.

p. 63: Similar to above, change "…were used to evaluate the ~~impact~~ of improvements to the ATP…" to "…were used to evaluate the effect of improvements to the ATP…"

p. 63: Add question mark to end of last bullet point.

p. 77: Word out of place in the first sentence? "…linking every center in the region and many regional destinations *including provide* access…"

p.77: Place parenthetical "(a 19% increase)" after "were added".

p. 81: Amend: "A bicycle district is an area with a concentration of transit, commercial, cultural, educational, institutional and/or recreational destinations where bicycle travel is intended to be

attractive, comfortable and safe."

p. 99: In fourth paragraph word should be "designing" not "deigning."

p. 100: Add a purpose statement to section under "Purpose of the ATP design guidance": "Provide guidance to encourage construction of the highest quality facilities that create safe, comfortable and attractive conditions for bicycling and walking."

p. 101: Simplify statements 5 and 6 by having them be one sentence long (first sentence). Include rest of statements as footnotes.

p. 102: Include NACTO Urban Street Design Guide

p. 103: Caption under photo is too extensive and bring up the topic of research. In general I think it would be useful to identify that right of way designs that include active transportation should respond to emerging research. The two citations I mentioned for current, ongoing research into cycle tracks are:

"Cycle Track Planning and Design Information" Best official information I have about it is a Task Order Proposal Request from FHWA (TOPR Number 6501-13020, released 7/31/13). Study has since been assigned to a contractor

Green Lane Project assessment of cycle tracks. Chris Monsere and Jennifer Dill are leading this effort. I'll see if I can get a specific reference.

[Lake McTighe] Added this information to the universal access section and slimmed down caption. Let me know if you find exact reference. I added a hyperlink to the green lane project webpage

p. 106: Under "Separation and protection from traffic": "…because they are physically separated the bikeway ~~can~~ may be narrower than a buffered bike lane."
In that vein, a two-way cycle track on one-side of the street may be the most efficient use of limited space if the design challenges can be met, though I don't know if you want to get into that level of detail.

p. 115: Eliminate the paragraph beginning with "Even in constrained contexts…"
That paragraph has the potential to undermine the design guidance that has preceded it throughout the document. It is the statement that "Ultimately, facilities should be designed in a …fashion that…adheres to local design standards,…" If the local design standards follow AASHTO, then all that would be required is a four-foot bike lane. I think there are sections in the document elsewhere that do a good job discussing context sensitive design. No need for this potentially damaging paragraph.

p. 116: Add reference to the *Designing for Truck Movements*… guide elsewhere in the document. As I mentioned above, it'd be better to include some reference about adhering to known guidance and emerging best practices and up-to-date research in roadway design, or something like that. Things are constantly changing…

p. 126: I think including the figures shown in Table 2 are premature. These figures for the 2035 modeled mode shares are based on a barely-tested, brand new model that is based on a exactly one study about bicycling behavior. This is in contrast to the reams of studies and analyses conducted to produce models for driving behavior (which are also proving to be wrong, as we've seen reported in the press, recently).

[Lake McTighe] Modeled transportation data suggests that the 2010 adopted Regional Transportation Plan is not meeting the Active Transportation target. Table 2 illustrates that based on modeled transportation data the region is not meeting the mode share targets for

walking, bicycling or transit in 2035. Mode share for bicycling increases slightly on the ATP recommended network, walking remains the same and transit decreases slightly.

Current policies and investments may not be aggressive enough to reach the active transportation target. Additionally, modeled data should be taken as only one piece of data. Incorporating pedestrian and bicycle modes into transportation models is still evolving; as models become more sophisticated and better at reflecting pedestrian and bicycle behavior modeled mode share results may change. Recent analysis conducted by the City of Portland demonstrated that some areas of Portland have the potential to achieve bicycle and pedestrian mode shares that achieve regional targets.

> p. 165: I wonder about the prioritization of funding strategies. Would it be better to add a facility where none exists today if that facility is in a remote, lightly-populated part of the region that does not have a lot of destinations nearby? Or, would it be better to improve an existing, below-standard bicycle facility in a densely-populated part of the region where trip distances are generally short? The first facility might result in 200 additional daily trips and the second might result in 2000 additional daily trips. At the very least, I would make those two funding strategies co-equal so they could enter an evaluation on an equal footing.

[Lake McTighe] I added this sentence to the first priority of filling gaps: Areas where a high demand for walking and bicycling and transit use already exist should be prioritized first.

> Again Lake, thanks for all your work on this. I look forward to the upcoming final rounds.
>
> Best,
>
> Roger

Roger Geller
Bicycle Coordinator / City of Portland, Oregon
503 823 7671 (w) / 503 823 7609 (f)
Active Transportation
NACTO

From: Lake McTighe
To: "Hillier, Robert"; Geller, Roger
Cc: Bower, Dan; Pearce, Art; Duke, Courtney
Subject: RE: Suggested edits to ATP Draft Plan
Date: Tuesday, January 21, 2014 3:59:00 PM

Hi Bob,

I moved reference to the "Designing for Truck..." document to the list of resources and provided a hyper link to it. Adding hyperlinks to the other documents as well.

- *Designing for Truck Movements and Other Large Vehicles in Portland* (adopted October 8, 2008) provides specific guidelines for maintaining access and mobility in the design of intersections and roadways. This resource includes a helpful section on design considerations in different urban environments. Also included are design considerations for pedestrian, bicycle and transit in freight districts. A checklist of basic engineering and development review considerations to assist roadway designers are applicable both in and outside Portland.

And, looking for better photos!

Thanks again.

Lake Strongheart McTighe
Project Manager
Active Transportation
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
503-797-1660
www.oregonmetro.gov/activetransport

Metro | Making a great place

Stay in touch with news, stories and things to do.
www.oregonmetro.gov/connect

From: Hillier, Robert [mailto:Robert.Hillier@portlandoregon.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 17, 2014 10:37 AM
To: Geller, Roger; Lake McTighe
Cc: Bower, Dan; Pearce, Art; Duke, Courtney
Subject: RE: Suggested edits to ATP Draft Plan

Suggestions:
Page 116: The section addressing freight and transit considerations was previously requested by several ATP Work Group members to include language for addressing the needs of freight movement under the Design Guideline chapter. Portland's "Designing for Truck..." document does identify context sensitive design in different urban environments and provides the "design for" and "accommodate" approach for addressing freight movement in those environments. The document also includes a checklist of basic engineering and development review considerations to assist roadway designers that was prepared by PBOT traffic engineering staff (aka "Lewis's Brain") that are applicable both in and outside Portland. While I agree that things are constantly changing, there are still many fundamental design principles the Designing for Truck document provides and would suggest keeping it in this chapter of the ATP as a resource guide.

Page 116: I would replace the photo of N. Interstate Ave with a better example of how to accommodate bikes/peds on a designated freight route - i.e., the multi-use path on N. Lombard Street in Rivergate.

General: Include direct links to the various design documents that are referenced in the ATP.

Bob Hillier
Freight Planning Coordinator
City of Portland Bureau of Transportation
1120 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 800
Portland, Oregon 97204
Phone: 503 823-7567
E-Mail: Robert.hillier@portlandoregon.gov

From: Geller, Roger
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2014 4:33 PM
To: Lake McTighe
Cc: Hillier, Robert; Bower, Dan
Subject: Suggested edits to ATP Draft Plan

Lake,

Thanks for running a very good, effective meeting today. I agree: it is a really good group that is working well together. As I mentioned to you, you are very close with a really nice plan that seems to have universal agreement (at least among people showing up). Nice work!

Below are some specific comments I have for the draft plan. They range from the grammatical ("add a question mark") to the substantive.

p.12: replace "…active transportation as a ~~real~~ transportation option…" with, "…active transportation as a more frequently used transportation option…"
It already is "real."

p.17: "…23 more Powell Boulevards to accommodate the increase in auto traffic generated by Portland residents alone.

p. 21 Definition of Active Transportation. Do not include transit in the definition, as that muddies the waters. If this is an Active Transportation Plan and we define transit as active transportation, then shouldn't this plan also include transit planning? I like the definition we previously used that defined active transportation as walking, bicycling and accessing transit by those modes.

From: Lake McTighe
To: "Owen, Jeffrey"
Cc: Hesse, Eric
Subject: RE: ATP draft 3 comments
Date: Tuesday, January 21, 2014 12:28:00 PM

Jeff,

Thank you again from your comments. I made all of the changes that you suggested. Thank you especially for providing suggested text – really helpful.

See comments below on your questions.

Lake

From: Owen, Jeffrey [mailto:OwenJ@TriMet.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2014 11:31 AM
To: Lake McTighe
Cc: Hesse, Eric
Subject: ATP draft 3 comments

Hi Lake,

Review draft 3 is looking great! We are getting close.

Just a few minor comments to review draft 3 of the ATP, based on the track changes page numbers handed out at last meeting on the 16th. Let me know if any of these don't make sense.

- Page 32 of Intro: Suggest replacing photo from inside Bike and Ride with outside shot attached showing exterior – more context.
- Page 32 of Intro: Wilsonville Bike and Walk Map: you could perhaps also plug that effort was funded through a partnership between Metro Regional Travel Options (1/2) and City of Wilsonville (1/2).
- 1-42: photo caption; slight change of language: "the Ice Age Tonquin Trail running alongside SW Boeckman Road in Wilsonville connecting to Graham Oaks Nature Park."
- 3-57: Photo of woman loading bike on MAX: Suggest making the current photo smaller, and adding in a photo of large bike parking plus bike lockers, attached.
- 8-82: Comment LSM67: If you are looking for more bike and ride text, perhaps also add after Hillsboro mention something to this effect, or take a small piece of the following: "In addition to existing bike and ride facilities at Beaverton TC, Sunset TC, and Gresham TC, TriMet is working in partnership with city and county jurisdictions to apply for funding to build additional bike and rides, with current planning focusing on enhanced bike parking facilities in areas such as Gateway TC in East Portland,

st

Orenco/NW 231 Ave in Hillsboro, Beaverton Creek in Beaverton, Goose Hollow in Portland, and Park Ave and Tacoma stations as part of the Portland-Milwaukie light rail line."

- 10-116: Under heading "Freight and transit operation considerations": a map is referenced showing regional bike/ped routes with transit routes: Does this map exist already, and if so, can you share with me?

[Lake McTighe] There is not a map that shows overlap with bus routes, though this would be good to have and I will work on making one. I revised text to clarify: As shown in the following two maps, many of the recommended regional pedestrian and bicycle routes overlap with freight routes. When designing pedestrian and bicycle facilities on these routes, local jurisdictions must facilitate safe and reasonably efficient vehicle operations for freight trucks along with safe and comfortable pedestrian and bicycle travel. Transit buses can encounter come of the same needs as freight trucks and share many of the same routes. Key factors for efficient and safe freight and bus movements on are lane widths, buffering between large vehicles and people walking and cycling, visibility through these buffers, turning radii, horizontal and vertical clearance and over-dimensional freight. In some instances it may be preferable to identify an alternate, parallel route for bicycle travel.

- 10-99: Note 84 refers to updating the "Best Practices in Transportation" to reflect "guidelines for transit and bicycle interaction" – Is this a document that currently exists, or just referencing a hopeful document in the near future?***[Lake McTighe]*** referencing a hopeful document. I edited to make clearer.

[Lake McTighe] Updates to the Best Design Practices in Transportation handbooks will add information on low-volume bicycle boulevards, alternate designs for high volume arterial streets (e.g. cycle tracks) and regional trails. The handbooks will add information on and address guidelines for transit and bicycle interaction, such as transit stops and stations and along light rail and streetcar routes, and include best practices and successful case studies integrating bicycle, pedestrian and freight facilities, especially within constrained roadways.

- 13-151: Please also add onto caption: "And WES Commuter Rail Service". (WES project is what paid for the bike lockers – accessing commuter rail)
- 13-145: Under Policy 1, item 1.6: small typo: "especially thoe that connect to transit"

Thanks,

Jeff Owen
Active Transportation Planner, TriMet
owenj@trimet.org | 503-962-5854
trimet.org/bike | trimet.org/walk

www.oregonmetro.gov

MAKING A GREAT PLACE

Metro

TRACK CHANGES
Click Here to View Document

REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

REVIEW DRAFT 3

January 2014

THE INTER TWINE