MEETING SUMMARY
Active Transportation Plan | Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
3:00-5:00 p.m., June 6, 2013

SAC Members present:

Suzanne Hansche, Elders in Action
Katherine Kelly, Gresham
Todd Borkowitz, Citizen Rep.
Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser, Clackamas County
Jeff Owen, TriMet
Shelley Oylear, Washington County
Roger Geller, PBOT
Stephanie Routh, Willamette Pedestrian Coalition
Lidwien Rahman, ODOT
Brad Choi, Hillsboro
Rob Sadowsky, Bicycle Transportation Alliance

SAC Members absent:

Allen Berry, Fairview
Derek Robbins, Forest Grove
Jose Orozco, Cornelius
Allen Schmidt, Portland Parks and Recreation
Aaron Brown
Hal Bergsma, Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation
Kate McQuillen, Multnomah County

Metro staff and guests present: Lake McTighe, Robert Spurlock, (Metro); Margaret Middleton, City of Beaverton.

Endorsement and adoption timeline concerns and options

Lidwien Rahman – Use freight and TSMO plans as example of process that we have used in the past. Minimal RTP update makes people suspicious that there will not be enough time to weigh in.

Lori Mastrantonio- don't want it to be more difficult to make changes in the RTP.

Roger Geller – Met with staff at City. TPAC representative is ok and is prepared to take action on endorsement. There is just a lot of information to absorb. It would be helpful for SAC members to talk to TPAC and MTAC members.

Katherine Kelley – ok with acknowledgement or endorsement. It is helpful, as Gresham completes TSP update to have the project list, whether or not prioritized.

Lori – need to have local support of the identified bikeways and parkways.

Lidwien – have some changes/suggestions for the FAQ. Need to clarify in words and on a map what is new. What is the new mileage. How many miles of new trails have been added. Also, concern about the cost of the networks. Add something about phasing. Need to identify early opportunities, specific projects. Have heard concern about requirements about design guidelines.

ATP Policy recommendations and actions
Policy 1.1. Do we need to define short trips?
-Roger and Katherine – flexibility is good. Better to leave at short. [*Subsequent stakeholder input has requested more definition. Trips under three miles are being considered as a definition]*

Katherine – metro safety report (action 1.1.4) – add details, safe crossings, lighting, protected facilities. [*added]*

Katherine – it is a problem to use the word "prioritize" for bicycle and pedestrian projects over other modes (action 1.2.3)

Hal – this really only comes into play on roadways. Consider using emphasize, accommodate, to recognize other modes (action 1.2.3)

Rob Sadowsky – don't take any action that jeopardizes safety. Recognize the need for traffic flow and safety, but don't maximize flow over safety. Prioritize safety for all modes over traffic flow. (action 1.2.3)

Shelley Oylear – perhaps use the word "ensure" – ensure that bicycle and pedestrian projects are safe and convenient. (action 1.2.3)

action (1.2.10) – use word encourage, local action not regional prioritization [done]

action (1.2.12) clean up wording [done]

Katherine – (1.2.15) this seems like asking for trouble [*revised]*

Hal- perhaps just tie to list of projects (1.2.15)

Shelley- need to keep it flexible (1.2.15) perhaps to include AT benefits within the project area?

Lidwien – at least all projects need to include the minimum of active transportation investments

Roger – flexibility is good

Policy 3

Lori- 1.3.1 – don't we already do this? It seems out of place [similar feedback from other stakeholders. This has been removed]

Aaron Brown – (1.3.2) add seek unique partnerships and emphasize underserved.

Kate McQuillan – (1.3.2) add safe routes, use word encourage [done]

1.3.4 balance with the greatest demand

Policy 4
Clarify what % complete means.

Lidwien - 1.4.2 – remove the word standard. Problem that it says to adopt a policy. Make it optional.

Roger – Policy 1.2, Add action items. Each community identifies X number of priority projects. Help prepare for next TIGER

Approach to categorizing projects for prioritization
Lidwien – need to better define bicycle and pedestrian districts [done]

Lidwien – clarify and's and or's. this approach is geographic, depends on where it is located. For prioritization we need to determine if it is better to complete a gap with minimum standards or make it something that exists better. Completing gaps seems more important.

Suzanne – completing gaps seems more important.

Katherine – it may be good to have a criteria that looks at the length of gap filled in proportion to the entire length created by filling the gap.

Lori – bicycle modeling is a new tool that does not always reflect local concerns and aspirations (and results in evaluation). Need to be careful about using outcomes from these regional level analysis to determine priorities. In the categorization the reference to cycle zones is too specific and suburban projects don't come out too well.

Roger – maybe prioritization is not needed for this project. The evaluations can be used for general guidance. O

Rob- the categorization approach is confusing and too high level.

Lidwien – describe how it can be used, how it can provide guidance.

Rob – Priority lists can change. It is good to highlight the value of innovation and the impact of projects.

Katherine – On EMCP struggled with priorities, ended up with bundles of projects. keep lists flexible to be able to respond to different funding sources. But we do need prioritized bundles. Maybe just list the projects in the top categories.