Active Transportation Plan | Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
Room 401, Metro Regional Center|2:30-4:30 p.m., Sept.6, 2012

SAC Members present:
Brad Choi, Hillsboro
Katherine Kelly, Gresham,
Stephanie Routh, Willamette Pedestrian Coalition
Rob Sadowsky, Bicycle Transportation Alliance
Lidwien Rahman, ODOT
Roger Geller, PBOT
Aaron Brown, Youth Rep. / The Intertwine
Todd Borkowitz, Citizen Rep.
Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser, Clackamas County
Hal Bergsma, Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation
Suzanne Hansche, Elders in Action
Shelley Oylear, Washington County
Kate McQuillen, Multnomah County
Jeff Owen/Eric Hesse, TriMet

SAC Members absent:
Allen Berry, Fairview
Heidi Guenin, Upstream Public Health
Allen Schmidt, Portland Parks and Recreation
Derek Robbins, Forest Grove
Jose Orozco, Cornelius

Metro staff and guests present: Lake McTighe, Anthony Butzek, John Mermin, Robert Spurlock, Dan Bower (PBOT), Sumi Malik (CH2MHill), Matt Berkow (Alta)

Announcements
Project Manager Lake McTighe opened the meeting. Jeff Owen is now with TriMet and will continue to serve on the committee in that capacity, leaving a position open for a Clackamas County city. There is still a vacant position for an equity perspective asked the committee to provide recommendations to fill these positions. She would bring new members up to speed on the process. Lake provided a recap of the Metro Council worksession briefing on the Existing Conditions report. SAC members gave announcements on Bike Commute Challenge, Walktober, Clackamas County bike commute challenge.

ATP Project Update and Review of Draft 2 Existing Conditions (EC) Report
Lake gave an overview the meeting agenda. She provided an overview of the project timeline and next steps.

The committee walked through changes and incomplete information in Draft 2 of the Existing Conditions report. Discussion points:

- Washington County mid-block crossings. Hal Bergsma described current proposal for Hall Blvd. Lake stated that reference to counties and cities utilizing mid-block crossings should be added to the EC report.
- There was a lengthy discussion about Tables 23 and 24 in the report, showing bike and ped crash rates per 10,000 bike/ped commuter. Concerns included that too little crash data (2007-10), Census commute data issues, and the random, fluctuating nature of crashes are not adequate to indicate trends of crash rates per bike/ped commuter. Various different approaches to describing the data were discussed, including leaving it out entirely and including the City of Portland's example of the crash rate decreasing as bicycle ridership increases; including more cities in the analysis; showing the data in a graph without reference to the cities. Lake stated that staff would explore different options and check back with a few of the committee members willing to work on the topic. Several committee members stated that it was important to provide this information in one form or another.
- Hal Bergsma, Katherine Kelley and Jeff Owen noted that THPRD, Gresham and Wilsonville are in the process or will soon be adding new regional trail segments and sidewalks and asked if these new additions could be added to the inventory of completed facilities. Lake responded that they should be added to the inventory because these needed to be updated on a regular basis (the ATP will provide input on a schedule) and that she would check with staff to see if the new segments could be included for the current analysis and upcoming evaluations.
- Lidwien Rahman asked for clarification on how complete bike and ped system was being used. She noted that not only completed segments of sidewalks and bike lanes should be used to describe a complete system, but that bridge gaps, crossings, trails, etc. needed to be included.
- In response to the description of the analysis of existing signalized crossings on the regional pedestrian network, there was a discussion about how need and gaps are described and understood in the methodology. Shelley Oylear stated that the existence of signalized crossings impacts different users in different ways. Access management can benefit bicyclists, for example. She stated that measuring the existence of crossings against the 530' guidelines (in the RTFP) can be arbitrary because land use and need are not taken into consideration and in some cases there may not be need for a crossing, so it should not be considered a gap. Lidwien noted that this is just to identify where the crossings are, not to determine deficiency. Lake noted that this analysis is still underway and the discussion will be taken into consideration. Staff will look at different ways to address the analysis. The current approach was to calculate the number of signalized crossings every 1,000' per length of the corridor. Staff will consider calculating crossings with number of intersections, including location of transit stops/crossings, and other potential measures.
- Roger Geller asked what makes an active transportation facility/trip regional vs. local. Lake stated that trips are local in nature but have regional impacts (the regional vs. local issue is thorny because pedestrians and bicyclists rely on dense, connected networks for most trips, while longer distance corridors are helpful for longer commute trips and

biking and walking for pleasure. Both are needed, the historical regional focus has been more on the corridors). The ATP is attempting to provide direction and an action plan to complete a seamless regional "spine" (yet to be defined) that the local system hangs off of. Much of the active transportation system is funded by federal dollars. Roger stated that a concept that focused on a tight weave of networks serving destinations could be better than focusing on linear corridors. Lidwien stated that defining/ identifying regional destinations would be helpful in determining where to focus at the regional level. Roger stated that every bike and walk trip is of regional significance because of the benefit they provide.

Lake concluded the overview of the EC report noting that:

- Once the pedestrian analysis and completed miles/gaps are finalized she will send the committee the updates and provide a deadline for additional comments.
- Lake stated that the EC report would be fully finalized at the end of the planning process; leaving it in draft form allowed additional information and data to be included if necessary. The final EC report will be recommended along with the final ATP by the SAC in Spring, 2013.

Emerging Themes from the EC report exercise and discussion

Lake provided a handout (attached) and described the proposed framework for developing principles and criteria for the ATP. The principles and criteria will be used to develop the network concepts and evaluate them.

SAC members and guests broke into groups and discussed emerging themes, and then reported out on them:

- Need for flexibility in guidelines, policies, etc. The active transportation network will look different in different parts of the region. The network needs to defined and developed in a context sensitive manner.
- Planning efforts for AT should focus on utilitarian trips. Recreation is important too, but the focus should be on using AT for daily needs instead of cars.
- Current goals are too timid and funding is inadequate. There is a need to grow the system as much and as quickly as possible.
- Recognize conflicts between bicyclists and pedestrians. Build a parallel complimentary system.
- Recognize that system elements identified as complete on maps (e.g. bike lanes, sidewalks, trails) may not be adequate (too narrow, lack of lighting, etc).
- Need to better define safety, including actual and perception of safety.
- Focus on access to centers. Can be achieved in different ways – context matters – trails, networks. One size does not fit all.
- Focus on replacing short trips by car and increasing access to transit.

- Bike and ped needs are not the same. Ped trips rely on areas with a high density of destinations. Bike is more of a mobility focus.
- Desire for AT is universal for all kinds of people with different needs.

Lake noted that staff would draft proposed principles and criteria. ATP workgroup(s) would convene over the next 4 weeks to work on the principles and criteria. Staff will start to develop network concepts. October 18 meeting will focus on the draft principles and criteria and network concepts.

Funding opportunities

Lake provided an overview of upcoming funding opportunities that the committee should be aware of. The funds represent a substantial amount of the potential funding available for AT (historically, 80% of all funding is from these federal sources). Lake noted that coordinating and communicating would help better projects come forward. Lake asked if there was interest in the SAC developing a regional AT proposal. Response was that short time frame and need to coordinate locally made this difficult. Lake suggested meeting with county coordinating TACs to provide an update on the ATP. Hal Bergsma suggested giving project updates at the Oct. 18 meeting. Lake agreed to add to the agenda.

2015-18 MTIP

ODOT Region 1 Enhance (http://cms.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/lgs/Pages/enhancement.aspx)

- Combines several programs
- 4-county ACT like selection committee
- Applications due Nov.27
- No $$ limit
- Approx $65 M for Region 1

Metro Regional Flexible Funds (http://rim.oregonmetro.gov/webdrawer/rec/245957/view/General%20Administrative%20Records%20%28GAR%29%20-%20A~ting%20Records%20-%20Joint%20Policy%20Advisory%20Committee%20on%20Transportation%20%28JPACT%29%20Packet.PDF)

- Process to determine program is underway
- JPACT makes final decision
- $98.5 M available (after light rail bonds)
- Solicitation packets could be released as early as this winter