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

Metro | *Making a great place*

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
Regional Active Transportation Plan
1:30-4:30 p.m. March 15, 2012
Metro Regional Center Room 501

SAC Members present:	Katherine Kelly, Gresham, Heidi Guenin, Upstream Public Health Jessica Engelmann, TriMet Brad Choi, Hillsboro Stephanie Routh, Willamette Pedestrian Coalition Rob Sadowsky, Bicycle Transportation Alliance Lidwien Rahman, ODOT Roger Geller, PBOT Derek Robbins, Forest Grove Aaron Brown, Youth Rep. / The Intertwine Todd Borkowitz, Citizen Rep. Jeff Owen, Wilsonville Allen Schmidt, Portland Parks and Recreation Jose Orozco, Cornelius Hal Bergsma, Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser, Clackamas County Suzanne Hansche, Elders in Action Shelley Oylear, Washington County Kate McQuillen, Multnomah County
SAC Members absent:	Carla Danley, OPAL and ABE Rep. Allen Barry, Fairview
Metro Staff present:	Lake McTighe, Rex Burkholder, Kathryn Harrington, Tom Kloster, Josh Springer, Mel Huie, Dylan Rivera, Anthony Butzek, Heath Bracket, Mathew Hampton, Chris Myers, Brooke Jordan, Robert Spurlock
Guests:	Jane McFarland, Multnomah County

Metro | *Making a great place*

Project Manager Lake McTighe of Metro began the meeting at 1:40pm

Meeting Summary: Ms. McTighe gave a presentation on the ATP, which provided context, objectives, a timeline and organizational structure for the project. Four objectives include: (1.) Develop Guiding Principles and Criteria for evaluating network alternative and for prioritizing funding and projects in the RTP and local TSPs that include equity, health, safety, economic development, and access and are consistent with the region's six desired outcomes; (2.) Identify the Principal Regional Active Transportation network, integrating walking, biking, and public transportation and creating a seamless, green network of on and off-street Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Parkways connecting the region (comments: add in mobility in #1, create options that allow people to get around faster); (3.) Develop Active Transportation policies, performance targets, and concepts that will update existing regional pedestrian, bicycle, trail, and transit policies, performance targets and design concepts, synthesize policies and priorities from other pedestrian, bicycle, trail and transit plans; (4.) Prioritize projects and develop a phased Implementation Plan and Funding Strategy that clearly articulates state, regional, and local roles and responsibilities. Currently, the ATP is apparent in the RTP but there is no clear direction for prioritizing and implementing projects.

Referring to Objective 1, Ms. Kelly noted that adding mobility as a criteria and/or guiding principle could create options for network users to get from location A to B faster

Referring to Objective 2, Ms. Rahman referred to the RTP Mobility Corridors and noted that every Mobility Corridor has an active transportation network.

Ms. Routh noted the importance of data and evaluation and asked if the project would include any recommendations on data, noting that it is important to quantify success. Ms. McTighe replied that Task 9 in the workplan focused on data protocols and maintenance and agreed that data was a critical foundation.

Ms. Guinen commented on the federal reauthorization bill, and how a lack of transportation funding could affect Safe Routes to School programs and projects. She asked what role MPOs (in light of less federal funding) could play in expanding/continuing Safe Routes to School. She stated that MPOs should support the program. There was a conversation about programs like Safe Routes to School crossing jurisdictional boundaries, and how new and existing projects would fit into the ATP. Ms. McTighe noted that Safe Routes programming will be considered as part of the funding and implementation strategy for the ATP.

Mr. Sadowsky noted that Safe Routes to School provide programming, education *and* infrastructure; 70-90% of funding is for programming.

Ms. Rahman stated that there are a lot of schools and that access to these schools may be more of a local focus. The committee needs discuss regional v. local, identifying the projects/corridors that provide regional high level mobility and the destinations that are served. So, high schools or universities may be regionally focused, but not elementary schools.. Ms. Rahman noted that the regional/local designation could vary by school with some Safe Routes facilities as part of the regional system. She then asked that the project should identify which jurisdictions are including Safe Routes in their local plan.

Ms. McFarland noted that a current drawback to Safe Routes to School is that it does not include high schools, and this may be more of a regional focus.

Mr. Geller said reconciling the regional-local conflict (i.e. the regional nature of corridors coupled with the local nature of trips) will be interesting and a challenge.

Mr. Robbins then noted that the developed corridors should have signs specifically identifying its function/role in the network. (e.g. "regional Westside Trail", "Bethany local access trail", "elementary school Safe Route")

Mr. Geller asked if the goal is to identify pedestrian and bicycle districts as areas to focus regional investment or if they would be limited to focus on the "spine" or corridors. Ms. McTighe replied that the SAC shouldn't feel limited to any particular structure at this point. The Concepts could include connected districts and/or corridors. The goal is good coverage everywhere, and the focus here will be the regional structure that the dense "local" network connects to.

Mr. Geller commented that SAC should start thinking about similarities between other high capacity transit systems like bus systems, ride share and other connections. Ms. McTighe noted that AT facilities will be cheaper and can be implemented faster than transit such as light rail.

Mr. Robbins noted that the transit analogy "a high capacity system for biking and walking" was helpful.

Ms. McTighe then discussed project phases, including (1.) looking at existing conditions and framing choices, (2.) developing network concepts and selecting alternatives, (3.) identifying priorities and implementing the plan. Ms. McTighe stated that the ATP will be coordinated with other related projects as well such as local TSP updates, Climate Smart Communities (CSC), SW Corridor Plan and East Metro Connections.

Mr. Sadowsky asked if there are other ATPs in regions or cities (such as Salt Lake City) that could studied for best practices. Ms. McTighe noted that an informal scan of regional bike/pedestrian plans has been done and could be written up to describe what has been done from other places. The review has shown that only in Canada and Europe are AT plans that integrate transit. There are interesting plans in Seattle and Tennessee, but both have a less prioritized strategy.

Ms. Oylear discussed the difference between transportation and recreation, and that data on this difference could inform investment priorities. Mr. Borkowitz commented that getting your workout in addition to transportation is a big benefit to AT. Ms. McTighe said that SAC shouldn't get too hung up on the distinction between recreation and transportation. Ms. Rahman commented that the ATP is a transportation plan and that what destinations are accessed can help determine the location of routes. Mr. Bergsma noted that it will also be important to take into consideration the infrastructure that is already in place, building on it. Mr. Sadowsky and Mr. Bergsma both mentioned access to parks and through trails, and that location informs design, e.g. circuitous vs. direct. Ms. Rahman also noted way-finding and lights as an outcome for design. Ms. McTighe stated that both circuitous, very low stress, direct on-road routes are needed and that separated bicycling and walking routes are also needed, and that there is not one trail type that will fit all situations.

Ms. Engelmann mentioned that other projects such as Climate Smart Communities (CSC) are relying heavily on the outcomes of the ATP. Ms. McTighe added that CSC has identified scenarios in which the region can achieve GHG emissions reduction goals via the community design. Ms. Engelmann stressed the need for the ATP to match up timing with other projects such as CSC.

Ms. McTighe noted that bike and walking is still considered by some as a nice amenity, but not yet thought of as a factor to economic prosperity. Research shows an impressive return on bike/pedestrian investment.

The SAC and guests participated in Success/Fail exercise, indentifying outcomes to the planning process that would signify success or failure. The SAC broke into three groups and generated ideas for about 5 minutes. They then reconvened and discussed some of the ideas. Ms. McTighe asked each group to pick a success and a failure to report back on. The full list of responses is included in the Themes for Success and Failure document.

Ms. McTighe then discussed SAC's role as a committee decision making process. Mr. Sadowsky asked if there would be a committee chair. Ms. McTighe stated that she had not thought the group would be chaired. Mr. Bergsma stated that he was more comfortable

with the current structure with Metro staff facilitating the meetings. Ms. McTighe stated that the current structure would remain.

Mr. Geller recommended propping up folded name cards if a member would like to speak. The SAC agreed. Ms. Guenin recommended holding up fingers "1,2,3" method of voting. 1 meaning firm yes, 2 meaning okay but discussion needed, 3 meaning a firm no. Ms. McTighe stated that this method, along with SAC ground rules would be posted at each meeting.

Mr. Brown asked about the different roles of ECAT and SAC. Ms. McTighe explained that ECAT is focused on building support and developing relationships in the business and health communities and that the SAC is the workgroup where recommendations and policy changes will originate. Ms. McTighe stated that SAC will make recommendations to the Metro Council. Mr. Bergsma asked how decisions will be made going through all of the various committees. Ms. McTighe stated that using her discretion she would get back to the SAC if there were looming questions, change of direction etc. Minor changes that raised at other (e.g. TPAC, JPACT) committee meetings would be incorporated at staff's discretion. The SAC would be notified but would be convened to discuss only if the change was significant. Ms. Engelmann recommended that there be a champion on each engagement committee, including MPAC, JPACT and TPAC. She explained further that action is more readily taken when a member is well-versed with the ATP. The ATP needs enthusiasm, not just acceptance, Ms. Engelmann said. Ms. McTighe agreed.

Ms. McTighe then asked members to fill out the stakeholder engagement form and to indicate relevant groups and organizations members have contact with regarding the ATP.

Lastly, Ms. McTighe explained the work group structure. There are four proposed groups, Bike Policy and Infrastructure, Pedestrian Policy and Infrastructure, Funding Strategies and Freight, Bike, Pedestrian and Transit Interface. The SAC agreed to the four groups.

Mr. Sadowsky recommended joint meetings for at least the Bike and Ped groups so work is not duplicated. Mr. Geller asked who else could be involved in the work group. Ms. McTighe explained that additional members (other than SAC) could be invited to attend some or all of the workgroup efforts. This provides an opportunity to engage more people and to bring in other expertise and perspectives.

Mr. Bergsma mentioned developing a marketing strategy, and figuring out how to get people to support and buy into the project could be the focus of an additional work group. Ms. McTighe thought that ECAT could potentially participate.

Metro | *Making a great place*

Ms. Guenin asked if any current members are able to represent freight. Mr. Sadowsky noted that he serves on the Oregon Access Management Task Force. Ms. McTighe noted that if needed the SAC could utilize the Regional Freight Task Force.

Ms. Engelmann asked for questions the work groups will explore in advance. Ms. McTighe reminded SAC that all meeting materials and work group outcomes will be shared with all members at least a week in advance.

Notes prepared by Josh Springer and Brooke Jordan

Follow up actions suggested by the SAC:

- Consider including a scan and review of other regional active transportation planning efforts in the Existing Conditions report.
- Develop draft questions for work groups to focus efforts.
- Indentify members of JPACT and MPAC that will focus on the ATP and provide an additional "voice" on the committees.
- Consider forming a marketing workgroup.

Attachments:

- Updated "Themes of Success and Failures"
- Draft Stakeholder Engagement Matrix (based on input from SAC)

Metro | *Making a great place*

The Regional Active Transportation Plan

We will be successful if….

- It is not just about transportation – it is also about healthy people and environment, healthy economy
- An inclusive process that grows a broad base of support
- Regional agreement on priorities, translating into more funding and policy changes
- Leads to projects on the ground
- Equity – everyone shares in the benefits and needs of underserved are addressed
- Is an exciting, living document that tells real stories – not a plan on the shelf
- Benefits both local and regional needs, there is local buy-in
- Clear implementation plan, with projects and implementers clearly defined
- Adopted by Metro Council and JPACT, amended to the Regional Transportation Plan
- Results in more and better data on bicycling and walking
- Support is developed for future action
- Includes bold policies to prioritize bicycling and walking projects
- Health indicators are included in performance measures

We will not have succeeded if….

- Plan sits on the shelf, does not do anything
- Priorities are not clear
- Lack of ownership, support – plan is unfunded
- Non-inclusive process limited to the usual suspects – does not grow the base of support
- Polarizes community (e.g. bikes vs. …)
- Miss an opportunity to integrated with other projects in the region
- Project is not focused

The Regional Active Transportation Plan

<u>List of all of the responses from Executive Council for Active Transportation</u>

We will be successful if…

- Unanimous adoption by JPACT
- Impact greenhouse gas emissions
- Brings public health into the discussion
- Understanding of positive economic benefit of AT
- Argues/makes the case why this matters
- It's also a health/economic/environmental plan
- Environmental/ health/growth/business case
- That we learn from other places
- We have identified the outline of a network
- All cities and communities can see a regional facility (line) in their area
- Supported by community for equity
- Process for input is inclusive (lessons of N. Williams)
- Higher standards for bikeways – e.g. min width bigger
- Will include stories from real people
- "workshed"
- CLF, equity, access
- Support for funding increases
- Vision clear, visual document
- Clear priorities
- Bite size implementation pieces
- We've developed it in the field, not at metro/MRC or Portland only
- Planning as an educational effort
- Uses photos, videos and bring it to life
- Attracting highly educated cohort
- Attracting business investment
- Keeping Portland distinctive
- Multi-modal, multi-media
- If championed by Beaverton and Gresham
- Big projects are "phased" for HCT Plan
- Local plans are synched
- Regional buy in and acceptance from both private and public sectors
- Local advocates are created
- Projects are ID with priorities
- Funding sources are established
- Responsibilities and accountability for implementation clear
- If "rebrands" active transportation
- Establishing patterns young which could remain through life
- Fun, visionary, inspiring

- Stimulates endorphins!
- If endorsed by PBA
- Broad based coalitions built
- Great "start-up" projects identified
- Communicates "excitement" over our opportunities

We will fail if…

- On the shelf
- It does not have regional support
- Becomes bikes vs. business
- Local cities and local community grass roots groups can't see themselves in the plan
- Does not outline a long range picture
- Only looks at big projects (ignores local)
- It's a static document – text only
- Ignores safety
- A process limited to advocates
- Usual suspects
- Lacks local ownership
- Lack of focus
- Unfunded
- No funding plan
- If plan is 200 pages of transit speak gobbly gook
- Lack of measureable outcomes
- Value (in AT) isn't seen
- Little money for AT
- Lack of specific project identified
- Opponents are louder
- Lackluster participation from participants
- Polarizes community, bikes vs…
- Lack of clear priorities
- Failure to act on clear priorities
- Too white, too old, too boring
- Peanut butter priorities (spread thin)
- Non inclusive of diverse audiences
- Too many 20th century solutions to 21st century problems

<u>List of all of the responses from the MetroCouncil</u>

We will be successful if…

- We have a plan
- The regional elected support funding to build the infrastructure

- More elected support/advocate for active transportation
- More people are bicycling in 5 years by __%
- People use active transportation to meet daily needs
- There will be a sidewalk at every bus stop
- I can ride my bike directly home without having to detour to feel safe
- Local TIPs (and TSPS) prioritize sidewalks and bike lanes in next 5 years
- Developing funding strategies is more about getting (targeting) new money and not solely focused (only) on redirecting existing sources of $$
- We will succeed if people of all ages see themselves as players
- Everyone who wants to bike or walk to work will find a way to do that
- More people feel safe walking or bicycling because of separate sidewalks and paths
- People understand the value of active transportation for the health and economy
- We have some fun along the way…
- The planning program has engagement/meetings out in the field. Let it be done "out there" versus Metro building

We will fail if…

- The language of the plan is not inclusive
- Plan elements are not implemented
- The measurement is more about costs and less about people
- The public sees it as bikes vs. cars
- The % of regional transportation $$ has not increased for active transportation
- Number of bike and pedestrian fatalities continues to increase every year
- The planning effort is completed with just Portland stakeholders
- We get a great plan but no money to build it
- People (especially) local elected think that this is about re-programming their local money – putting it under Metro control

List of all of the responses from Metro Staff Project Team

We will be successful if…

- We learn from other places
- Simple, imageable diagram that is easy to "get"
- Lays out clear strategy for implementation
- Collective buy-in that the plan is appropriate
- Leads to projects on the ground
- Products that are incorporated back into the RTP
- Builds on momentum that more and more people value having several transportation choices
- Results in a uniformly high quality experience
- No loose ends
- Regional acceptance of holistic AT approach

- Addresses needs of underserved
- Local buy-in
- Dedicated funding source
- Data plan that is very useful
- Defined, funded, maintained trail/bike/ped count program
- AT becomes a funded plan
- Bold policies
- On-street gaps in major regional trails are prioritized as regional bike parkways
- Funding for bike and ped network maintenance and standard products
- Future grant funding is allocated according to this final recommended list of priority corridors
- World class bike network and model outputs/products
- General prioritization of implementation as funding becomes available
- Priorities defined
- Adoption of plan by JPACT and Metro Council
- ATP adopted by JPACT and Council and endorsed by MPAC
- Updated bike/ped data and protocols for maintenance defined
- Support developed for further action
- Health measures are included

We will fail if…

- Continuation of fragmented modal approaches
- Fails to be implemented locally
- Too much on-street
- No clear priorities
- Regional communication breaks down
- Staff are frustrated by process
- Lack of focus
- No plan for ongoing funding
- The public does not support
- Unclear next steps/implementation approach and sits on shelf
- Failure to make difficult decisions, e.g network definition, policy or funding priorities
- Missed opportunity for integrating data/tools with other projects

<u>List of all responses from ATP Stakeholder Advisor Committee:</u>

We will be successful if…

- Active transportation facilities identified in the plan are well-connected and, on some level, equitably distributed in terms of geography and socio-economic status.
- Implementable plan that is equitable in terms of helping communities with infrastructure deficiencies succeed in constructing infrastructure gaps.
- All jurisdictions feel represented.

- Quick transition from Plan completion to implementation with relatively steady implementation.
- Neighboring jurisdictions produce well laid-out bicycle and pedestrian visions.
- We have a clear list of priorities and regional buy-in.
- Leads to funds to build and own.
- Safe routes are defined for all constituencies.
- Residents from jurisdictions all over the region come out to volunteer to collect bicycle and pedestrian datasets.
- This strategy can acknowledge the influx and impacts of urban users on our rural transportation systems. The linkages and connections to these rural areas ought to be considered as part of the regional network.
- The recommendations are broadly supported by "the public".
- The plan recognizes that needs and values differ throughout the region. We're not all inner-city Portland.
- Identify shovel-ready projects.
- Identify existing successes of concepts.
- Equitable active transportation network region-wide.
- Identified, sustainable funding source.
- Network active transportation gaps minimized.
- Outcomes achieve regional consensus within our group and beyond.
- Local jurisdictional support for plan.
- Commitments to include local plans.
- We (the region) inspire AT planning elsewhere in the United States.
- Understand what needs to be achieved at each step.
- We can gather energy for corridors like we have for rail corridors.
- Clearly identified network that reflects clear criteria that are based on world best practices.
- Guiding principles produce clear differences in ranking and evaluating alternatives.
- Our work incorporates what we're learning in Climate Smart Communities and what our peer learned in King County (a priority tool): bay area monetizing active transportation impacts.
- Produce a plan that can be adopted into local transportation system plans.
- Network for prioritization and accurately reflect local, already identified priorities.
- Clear framework of regional funding for active transportation.
- We secure a large amount of money from the federal government for a regional active transportation project that crosses jurisdictional lines and includes bicycle and pedestrian components.
- Ability to clearly articulate project findings and results by all involved.
- Jurisdictions and communities feel their efforts and priorities have been respected and Metro has added value to active transportation efforts.
- Develop a plan that becomes a model for other regions around the country.

- Our process includes open dialogue, consensus, active communication, and clear messages.
- Tie prioritized projects to projections of aging populations.
- We have a prioritized and agreed upon list of bicycle and pedestrian improvements on or parallel to state highways.
- Develop regional policy for safe routes to school.
- Projects match what may be feasibly funded.
- We include access to and from parks and schools.
- We have a clear understanding of regional and local roles and responsibilities for building and maintaining the AT networks.
- Follow in footsteps or direction of Executive Council.
- We don't over-process.

We will fail if…

- We over-process.
- If Climate Smart Communities initiative and new Regional Transportation Plan doesn't reflect the work and priorities of this project.
- The AT network does not get us all the way to the places we would need to get to, when we want or need to .
- We do not address equity and jobs.
- We don't address values that speak to auto drivers.
- Produce a plan that sits on the shelf that no one wants to read.
- If this doesn't result in a high level policy discussion with our elected where we consider how to raise more money regionally for active transportation and make sure it's a stable source.
- We don't have clear funding sources identified.
- We continue to lose out on federal competitive grants and get chastised for lack of vision.
- We don't consider displacement impacts and include strategies to make sure regional amenities are accessible to all.
- We don't have input from a variety of system users as well as those who are not currently using (or often using) AT facilities.
- Projects do not match TSP project lists.
- Have not developed unified definition of walkable communities, and how integrated transportation and land use planning improve walking.
- Superficial recommendation not well supported by available data and information.
- Metrics/measurements of success aren't outlines, must discuss/strategize ways to quantify plan's benefits.
- Local jurisdictions think of plan as not of use or pertaining to them. Perception of making every area like Portland and not responding to differences in the region and citizen preferences.

- New funding not identified.
- Plan does not explicitly account for changes in age demographics (i.e. older and younger) relative to active transportation needs.
- The policy and elected levels cannot get behind the recommended investment strategy.
- Equity is not a central theme and criteria in our project priorities and policy development.
- Slow or lagging implementation.
- Just another plan not implemented.
- Lack of public input/support for the ATP, concept, and vision.
- My neighbors have no idea what ATP is, or why it's important.
- Equity is not front and center.
- Barriers remain unidentified.
- This plan just sits on the shelf.
- Some communities are not represented.
- Community concerns re: urban cyclists who heavily use our rural roads in a manner that is very impactful are not addressed.
- Any components of system fail to be adequately maintained.
- If there isn't a high likelihood of feasibility- implementability.

SAC Stakeholder Engagement MATRIX ~ DRAFT

Highlighted rows=no SAC connection	Bergsma	Berry	Borkowitz	Brown	Choi	Engelmann	Geller	Hansche	Guenin	Kelly	Mastrantonio-Meuser	McQuillan	Orozco	Owen	Oylear	Rahman	Robbins	Routh	Sadowsky	Schmidt
Business/Economic Development																				
East Metro Economic Alliance										X			X							
Westside Economic Alliance	x				X															
Columbia Corridor Association																		X		
Portland Business Alliance							x												x	
Oregon Business Council																				
Greater Portland Inc.																		X		
Portland Development Commission																				
Portland Regional Partners for Business																				
Columbia Cascade River District										x										
Government and Agencies																				
JPACT, TPAC, MPAC, MTAC	X			X	X	X			X											
City Mayors and Councils					X		X										X		X	
TriMet leadership						X												X		
TiMet Committee on Accessible Transit						X														
ODOT leadership																X				
Oregon Transportation Commission																X				
Oregon Bike and Pedestrian Committee																		X		
Congressional Delegates and staff							X											X		
Oregon Access Management Task Force																		X		
Washington County																				
Washington County Coordinating Committee and TAC	X				X	X														
Washington County Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator																				
Washington County Bicycle Transportation Coalition																				
Washington County Board of Commissioners																				
Tualatin Parks and Recreation District and Board	X																			
Washington County Planning Commission																				
Washington County Public Affairs Forum	X																			

SAC Stakeholder Engagement MATRIX ~ DRAFT

Highlighted rows=no SAC connection	Bergsma	Berry	Borkowitz	Brown	Choi	Engelmann	Geller	Hansche	Guenin	Kelly	Mastrantonio-Meuser	McQuillan	Orozco	Owen	Oylear	Rahman	Robbins	Routh	Sadowsky	Schmidt
Beaverton Bicycle Advisory Committee	X																			
Washington County Health and Human Services					X															
TV Highway Steering Committee					X	X														
THPRD Trails Advisory Committee	X																			
Tigard Bike Advisory Committee																				
Hillsboro Multimodal Transportation Advisory Committee																				
Multnomah County and Portland																				
East Multnomah County Transportation Committee										X		X								
Multnomah County Commissioners												X								
Multnomah County Planning Commission												X								
Multnomah County Health Department																				
City of Portland Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees							X											X		
Portland Parks Advisory Board																			X	
Multnomah County Bike & Ped Committee												X								
City of Gresham Transportation Sub-committee										X										
Multnomah Youth Commission (serves City of Portland)																				
Clackamas County																				
Clackamas County Coordinating Committee and TAC																				
Clackamas County Board of Commissioners											X									
North Clackamas County Parks and Recreation District and Board											X									
Clackamas County Planning Commission											X									
Clackamas County Pedestrian and Bikeway Committee											X									
Wilsonville Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force																				
Community and Advocate groups																				
Accessibility and the Built Environment																				
Willamette Pedestrian Coalition Board																X				
Bicycle Transportation Alliance and Board																		X		
Bike Walk Vote																				

SAC Stakeholder Engagement MATRIX ~ DRAFT

Highlighted rows=no SAC connection	Bergsma	Berry	Borkowitz	Brown	Choi	Engelmann	Geller	Hansche	Guenin	Kelly	Mastrantonio-Meuser	McQuillan	Orozco	Owen	Oylear	Rahman	Robbins	Routh	Sadowsky	Schmidt
Organizing People Activating Leaders - OPAL				X					X											
Elder Groups						X														
Elders in Action																				
AARP																				
Coalition for a Livable Future									X									X		
East Portland Action Plan Committee							X													
The Intertwine Alliance and Board				X																
Upstream Public Health									X											
African American Health Coalition																				
Verde																				
Latino Network									X											
Urban League									X											
Westside Transportation Alliance				X	X				X											
Native American Youth Family Center - NAYA									X											
Northwest Health Foundation									X									X		
Black United Fund																				
Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon - APANO									X											
Community Cycling Center									X									X		
Oregon Public Health Institute									X											
Regioal health care providers																				
Youth and Schools																				
Oregon School Board Association,																				
Susan Castillo, Superintendant of Public Instruction																				
Confederation of Oregon School Administrators																				