Active Transportation Plan | Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
Room 401, Metro Regional Center|3:00-5:00 p.m., October 18, 2012

SAC Members present:
Brad Choi, Hillsboro
Katherine Kelly, Gresham,
Rob Sadowsky, Bicycle Transportation Alliance
Lidwien Rahman, ODOT
Aaron Brown, The Intertwine
Todd Borkowitz, Citizen Rep.
Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser, Clackamas County
Hal Bergsma, Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation
Suzanne Hansche, Elders in Action
Kate McQuillen, Multnomah County
Jeff Owen, TriMet
Allen Schmidt, Portland Parks and Recreation

SAC Members absent:
Allen Berry, Fairview
Derek Robbins, Forest Grove
Jose Orozco, Cornelius
Shelley Oylear, Washington County
Heidi Guenin, Upstream Public Health
Stephanie Routh, Willamette Pedestrian Coalition
Roger Geller, PBOT

Metro staff and guests present: Lake McTighe, John Mermin, Robert Spurlock, Matt Berkow (Alta Planning), Scott Hoelscher (Clackamas County)

Announcements/updates

- Lidwien Rahman asked about the status of the Pedestrian Coordinator in Transportation Planning at Metro (the position for the person that has served in that role has been vacant and is currently being filled). Lake McTighe responded that she is currently serving as the Ped Coordinator and was not sure if the duties of the planner position being filled would include that duty.

- Referring to the cover memo for the meeting, Lake noted that a new time has been identified for public engagement on the network concepts. A public workshop will be developed for late Jan, early Feb, and will highlight the evaluation results of the network concepts.

- Lake reminded the SAC about the Intertwine Summit on Oct. 25, featuring an active transportation workshop. Participants in the workshop were asked to identify priorities for investments using the ATP cycle zone analysis and analysis of pedestrian corridors and districts.

- Lake noted that she would schedule Workgroup meetings for bike network and ped network – proposed week of Nov. 5, small groups, to develop network concepts

- Lake provided an update on providing new data to determine bicycle and pedestrian crash rates per bike or ped mile traveled, as opposed to the number of bike or ped commuters or per capita. Metro determined bicycle miles traveled (BMT) from using the TRMS bicycle modeling tools. Pedestrian miles traveled are still being developed and will be available soon. The BMT provide a different way to understand the bicycle crash rate in the region's larger cities. Lake provided a handout with the new crash rate for bicycles and the calculated BMT for cities in the region. She explained that they would only use the data for the larger cities, since application of the bicycle modeling tools to analysis at micro-level scales is inappropriate. (see draft attached) Katherine Kelly and Hal Bergsma expressed support for the new approach. Metro staff plan on exploring the factors that contribute to the BMT estimates and bringing that information to the SAC.

Meeting Overview

Lake reviewed the purpose of the meeting: The objective of the meeting is for the SAC to reach agreement on a set of principles for the regional active transportation network and a set of criteria for evaluating alternative active transportation networks, and to provide guidance on the proposed approaches for developing a set of alternative bicycle and pedestrian active transportation network concepts.

Principles Discussion

A special focus on trails used for transportation was added to the discussion of principles as this had come up at the workgroup discussion and seemed to be a topic that needed to be covered. The SAC had several comments on the topic. After some discussion it was decided that a future discussion was needed with materials supporting the discussion, such as information on lighting, surveys on current use of trails, federal transportation guidelines for trails, etc.

- A few members mentioned FHWA/AASHTO guidelines. To be eligible for federal transportation funding trails need to meet certain guidelines, these guidelines may be sufficient for "defining" a regional transportation trail.
- Katherine Kelly noted that use of the term "trail" needs to be examined. Trail has different meanings. Some jurisdictions use path or multi-use path in place of trail.
- Robert Spurlock (Metro staff) stated that talking about comprehensively lighting trails is a non-starter because it is too expensive. Alan Schmidt agreed that cost was very prohibitive.

- Hal Bergsma stated that there needed to be a discussion about what it meant to be open at all times of day and accessible at all times, and that lighting is context sensitive.
- Lidwien pointed out that the discussion today was about a principle, not on how to implement.
- Robert Spurlock noted that the topic of lighting would receive a lot of push back from habitat advocates.
- Lidwien noted that if the trail is a transportation facility it needs to function as such, including being accessible and well lit.
- Lidwien Rahman stated that there should be a principle about trails and utilitarian transportation; trails that are identified as part of the transportation network need to be designed to support that use, such as having lighting. Other SAC members agreed that a principle about trails was appropriate. However, later in the discussion members agreed that the word trail did not need to be included in the principles, but a principle about access should be included.
- SAC members agreed that Principle #1 was repetitive of other principles and could be deleted.
- SAC members agreed that reference to the 2040 centers needed to be added to iterate that current and *future* destinations are considered in making network connections. (see new Principle, #10)
- Add "connected" to Principle #2
- Add "design of routes and facilities" to Principle # 9
- Include regional destinations in Principle # 2
- Principle #2, the term natural systems is unclear.
- Simplify the principles as much as possible

Criteria Discussion

- Hal stated that there should be a focus on serving high density households and employment in the access criteria.
- Rob Sadowsky noted that some educational institutions, such as high schools, have populations over 1,000 and should be included as regional destination.
- Lidwien noted that the scale of the bike/ped analysis needed to be decided, such as including high schools but not elementary schools.
- Lake handed out, as an example, the analysis used by the High Capacity Transit planning process that identified regional attractors. Members noted that transit and parks needed to be added. There was general agreement that the "scale" of destinations represented in the HCT example was appropriate, but that the destinations for the AT analysis still needed to be refined.
- Comments on grocery stores included needing to include small markets and corner stores.
- Lake stated that cost was included on the list of the criteria (even though it received a lower number of votes at the Sept. 26 workgroup discussion) because it will be important in considering trade-offs. However, she proposed removing the cost criterion

from this stage of the evaluation, and including it in the next stage, when additional benefits (e.g. health, GHG, etc) w and tradeoffs 9cost, feasibility, political will, etc) would need to be included in selecting the alternative. Lidwien argued for keeping it on the list, noting that access and safety were benefits. Jeff Owen, Katherine Kelly and Suzanne Hansche stated that they thought it should be included later.

- Increased activity. The description of this criterion was unclear, especially the increase length of trips.

Bicycle Network examples

John Mermin walked through the memo on Bicycle Network Concepts, going over each of the examples.

- Shelley Oylear provided comments via email stating a preference for the grid concept with an active transportation highway system that like the highways connect cities (or maybe regional centers?) to each other, a truly regional travel system.
- Lidwien noted that the 2040 concept does not lend itself to a central city oriented spoke and hub.
- Hal suggested looking at a hybrid web (Westside) and grid (Eastside).
- Lidwien mentioned a web with multiple centers.
- It was noted that connecting centers was important.
- Brad Choi asked for clarification that the bicycle network concept would provide the highest level regional network. Lake responded that this was correct. These would be the “highway” or the “HCT” system of the overall bike network.
- Lake briefly described the bicycle model tool and how it would be used for the evaluation of the different network concepts that the SAC developed.
- Katherine Kelly asked if we would be focusing on arterials and collectors. Lake stated that the current RTP bicycle vision, which included many arterials and collectors, could be considered for the high level Regional Bicycle Parkways.

Pedestrian Network discussion

Jeff Owen asked if the pedestrian topic could be addressed earlier at future meetings so it was not left with little time for discussion. Lake said yes.

Lake walked through the Pedestrian Network Concept memo. She stated that the approach to evaluating the pedestrian network would be different from the bike network concepts. Unlike the bike network concepts which would be evaluating different network structures, alternate pedestrian networks would not be proposed. Instead, the potential of improvements to the regional pedestrian network for increasing access, safety and equity would be demonstrated using GIS analysis. Each improvement would be measured separately in order to understand the potential impact of each type of improvement.