

**Summary of Plan Edits from 8/25 Meeting Discussion**

*This document contains all PAC member comments received at the August PAC meeting or subsequent email correspondence. Staff has noted the PAC member comment, any considerations for PAC member review, the corresponding change, and a column for any additional PAC notes. At the October PAC meeting, the PAC will have an opportunity to discuss these, or provide additional comments, prior to the OTC meeting in November.*

Plan Location	PAC Member Comment	Considerations	Responding Edit	PAC Member Notes
General - Speeds	The term 'appropriate' is used in the speed strategy (1.1F) and is defined in footnote 5. Questions were raised about the definition and why lower speeds might not be appropriate on some routes (e.g. freight)	The definition clarifies that roadway classification and functionality must be taken into account along with safety concerns to determine if lower speeds is the right solution. Because of the classification and function of interstates, lowering speeds on those roadways is not appropriate. Similarly Expressways and Freight Routes* are classified to favor through movement and move people and goods quickly. These routes call for higher speeds and thus lowering speeds <i>may</i> not be appropriate. In some circumstances there may be no other way to address the safety concern and thus lower speeds could be employed  * Another questions was raised stating speed is often confused with throughput. In the example of freight routes, that designation explicitly calls for higher speed facilities	No change made  Discuss with PAC	
	Footnote 5 should not include reference to ORS 366.215		Reference deleted	
	Strategy 1.1G should be stronger, allowing for lower posted speeds	The process for setting posted speed is legislative. This plan calls out the need to look at lowering speeds as a way to improve safety, evaluate the current processes for setting or changing speeds, and to make recommendations accordingly. Without legislative authority this is as far as the strategy can go	No change made	
Overall	Right to left justify		Reformatted	
Overall	Update statistics where appropriate	Plan includes most recent data from sources used	No change made	
Overall	Use Oregon statistics where appropriate	Reviewed all statistics in Plan  Four graphic statistics were not specific to Oregon: Page 7 - Illustrates general millennial patterns nationwide - could not find anything specific to Oregon Page 17 (no longer included) - Aging in place Page 17 - Emissions graphic Page 75 - Walking to transit stops	Deleted "aging in place" statistic (first draft page 17) due to concerns about negative message  No change made to the other statistics given plan relevance	
Overall	Examine sidebars, they could be misinterpreted as substantive where they are not intended		Revised to be less prominent, where appropriate	
Page 2	ODOT Project Team divisions are incorrect		Revised section	
<b>Chapter 1</b>				
Page 7, third sentence	Phrase 'but are concerned' is awkward	Language comes directly from data source	No change made for consistency with data	
Page 7	Check on statistic of '41% percent of all trips are 3 miles or less'	Data was used from a 2014 National Household Travel Survey report	No change made	
Page 7	Include more about aging population, recreation, and transportation	Page includes information about these aspects, further additions would be redundant with Chapter 2	No change made	
Page 8	Improve the sentence 'The comfort level of walking and biking facilities...'	Information was taken from the report on level of traffic stress	No change made	
Page 8, second paragraph	Sentence: 'In addition, a reexamination of biking and walking from a systematic standpoint is needed' needs to be carried out throughout the document		Added information about defining the system	
Page 8	Insert information on how important it is to integrate and find funding for biking and walking facilities		Added more information at the end of page 8	
Page 9, Green Box	Description does not sound like Plan carries any authority		Revised to show that Plan is not a 'suggestion.' Process and authority is discussed more in Legal Context Appendix	
Page 10	Add ' - of modes' to the Equity bullet	Equity refers to social equity as it relates to transportation options and accessibility to the system	No change made	
<b>Chapter 2</b>				
Page 15	Call out box is \$83.8 million in gross sales and is over \$400 million		Revised to include gross sales and removed 'nearly' from \$400 million figure	
Page 15	Add lower health care costs and clean air value to economic benefit section	Information is included further in chapter 2, which expands upon issues specifically related to health and the environment. To minimize redundancy, no edits were made	No change made	
Page 16	Under health benefits, add 'and bike' to sentence 'In addition, having places for older adults to walk...'		Added	

Plan Location	PAC Member Comment	Considerations	Responding Edit	PAC Member Notes
Page 17	Graphic - Tie active transportation to reduction of chronic diseases instead of obesity		Changed	
Page 17	Change tailpipe graphic		Changed	
Page 17	Short trips by car are the most polluting. 40-50% of trips by car are less than three miles	Section includes discussion on motor vehicles creating higher emissions.	No change made	
Page 17	There are no assertions of policies and commitment related to GHG goals	The STS targets are listed that describe the shift that would need to occur from SOV to bike/ped in order to achieve the STS vision. This explicitly calls out the level of commitment needed for GHG, but this plan is about several goals and our plans do not establish targets for those goals, they track performance	No change made	
Page 18	Add more in about ADA and disability rights	Because ADA is law it is not repeated in the plan, however, an explanation of what it is was added	Language added to end on "Mobility Benefits" section	
Page 19	Add Cycle Oregon to the list of groups		Added	
Page 20	Add in racial profiling as a cultural barrier to use	How laws are enforced is under the authority of law enforcement agencies and therefore will not be addressed in this plan	No change made	
Page 20	Bold second to last paragraph on page 'Beyond perceptions...'	Made more prominent by making this it's own paragraph, since no other text within document is in bold	Made it's own paragraph	
Page 21	This section is too residential focused, need to include more about commercial and industrial centers		Included this in paragraph	
Page 23	Are the issues and opportunities in the appendix	Issues and Opportunities as they relate to the Plan were included directly within and are not a separate appendix	No change made	
Page 23	Bold sentence 'While lack of volume data makes it difficult...'	Will make more prominent by making this it's own paragraph prior to OTC public review, since no other text within document is in bold	Will make it's own paragraph	
Page 23	Add in graphic on pedestrian fatalities rates when hit by a motor vehicles at varying speeds		Added per existing statistic on page 23	
Page 23	Cyclists and pedestrian are vulnerable users, not just considered as such		Revised to indicate pedestrian and cyclists are vulnerable users	
Page 23	On the statistic graphic, further list the demographic information of who is getting hit, not just how many people	This is a level of detail greater than most other data included in the plan and benefit of showing this more specific data is unclear. In addition, may be time intensive to gather data	No change made	
Page 24	Include that a perception of safety is also a barrier to using the system		Added language in last paragraph about the need to collect perception data and that perception can be a barrier to use	
Page 25	Define access as broader than access to the biking and walking system, but access to key destinations as well	Destination such as schools, shopping areas and downtowns are discussed in text	No change made	
Page 26, first sentence	The definitions of mobility and accessibility need clarity in relation to how they are normally used	These are the way each term is used in the goal areas, where accessibility is how people access the system and mobility is about ease of movement on the system	No change made	
Page 27	This section should discuss access to employment areas		Added new language to this paragraph	
Page 27	Strengthen discussion of older adults needing biking and walking options and how systems attract millennials to communities with these options		Added discussion of biking and walking as essential to members of the community	
Page 27	Add in something about not losing lives is also a part of economic vitality		Added into health section on page 16	
Page 27	Rewrite first sentence of second paragraph regarding benefits of community landscape		Revised	
Page 27	Check statistic on graphic, recent figures may be higher	Reviewed and is consistent with latest published figures	No change made	
Page 28	The message of this graphic is unclear	Intended to show that of those without a car, how many people who walk or bike to work are above the poverty level	Revised	
Page 28	Does equity include equity of all modes	Equity refers to social equity as it relates to transportation options and accessibility to the system	No change made	

Plan Location	PAC Member Comment	Considerations	Responding Edit	PAC Member Notes
Page 28	Health section - Strengthen last sentence, to make health a goal area and not just consider		Revised	
Page 30	Data and performance measure paragraphs should call out specific actions within them, such as the need for regional trail data	These are issues and opportunities that were raised as part of the process. To address these issues, policies and strategies have been incorporated into Chapter 3.  In addition, data and performance measures are listed as Key Initiatives to further this work through future processes	No change made	
<b>Chapter 3</b>				
Introduction	Who is responsible to implement policies is unclear		Added new language to be clear that policies apply to all transportation agencies unless otherwise stated	
Policy 1.1	The strategies do not explicitly say to 'build safe streets' or elude to building safer streets	The goal is to 'Provide safe and well connected streets...' the strategies are ways to achieve this through mechanisms such as updating design guidelines, determining ways to achieve different cross sections, and improving visibility, etc.	No change made	
Footnotes	Footnote 5 refers to ORS 366.215, but should not		Reference to ORS 366.215 removed	
Strategy 1.1G	What does "as appropriate" mean?		Deleted text	
Strategy 1.2B	Where in the safety policies is there reference to "red light running", which is a concern for pedestrians	See Strategy 1.2B that is about educating motorists on the risks of distracted and impaired driving. Although not explicit, this strategy would target lane departures, red light running, and other incidents that occur as a result of distraction or intoxication	No change made	
Strategy 1.2F	The DMV could restructure the education aspects of getting a driver license. Testing could be more rigorous addressing the needs of a more complex system	Will submit this comment to TSAP staff as they examine educational opportunities within the TSAP process	No change made	
Policy 1.3	Interest in solidifying and strengthening Safe Routes to School programs	Strategies under Policy 1.3 are intended to identify opportunities for and implement SRTS type programs  Strategies 8.2A and 8.2B collectively cover continued investments in SRTS over the planning horizon, solidifying these types of programs and emphasizing their importance  Plan is purposeful to call out SRTS but talk about these as SRTS-type programs, as the name of these activities may change  The Transportation Options Plan also has policy language on SRTS	No change made	
Policy 1.4	Should there be more said in the plan about enforcement and enforcing of laws	Strategy 1.4C and 1.4D hit on the need for enforcement to ensure a safe system. The amount of enforcement or how it is done is outside the authority of transportation agencies and therefore this plan  Enforcement is likely to be more heavily discussed in the Transportation Safety Action Plan. This relationship between plans is further described in the new Legal Context appendix of the Bike-Ped Plan	No change made	
Strategy 2.2A	Replace 'to encourage' with 'for'		Changed	
Policy 2.6	What is the intent of Regional Paths in this section	Off system bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is covered through Policy 2.5, which talks about bringing about all manner of paths and trails and 2.6 expands upon that to prioritize ones which serve a broader region. Both strategies recognize the importance of all paths and trails, and 2.6 helps to emphasize that paths meeting the criteria are 'critical connection' points in the state.	No change made	
Policy 2.6	Why is there a population threshold in the criteria - what about rural communities	Criteria is used to prioritize some paths above others, particularly ones that can serve moderate population bases for all types of travel - such as Bear Creek Greenway and I-205	No change made	
Policy 3.1B	What does "using ADA best practices" mean? ADA identifies requirements	Text should be modified as the strategy is not about ADA requirements	Deleted text	
Policy 3.2	Add more specific references to the need for regular maintenance activities, such as sweeping		Added sweeping as an example to Strategy 3.2G	
Strategy 3.2D	Replace 'consider' with 'make'	Consider is used since biking and walking solutions may be one of many options to reduce motor vehicle congestion	No change made	
Strategy 3.2F	Remove 'where feasible'	There may be instances where it is not feasible to add bicycle detection loops, specifically for those improvements that include only slight modification. However, any improvements should consider, and include, these improvement when appropriate.	No change made	

Plan Location	PAC Member Comment	Considerations	Responding Edit	PAC Member Notes
Strategy 3.3A	Remove 'where possible'		Removed	
Goal 4	Add "tourism" to goal language		Added "tourists"	
Strategy 4.1E	Replace 'Encourage provision' with 'Provide'	This is specific to land use which is outside of the authority of this Plan. Local codes may require parking, this plan can only encourage	No changes made	
Goal 5	Equal distribution is not equity		Added "today and in the future" to the end of the last sustenance in the call out box to stress that equity means addressing current issues and equal distribution going forward	
Goal 5	Why is disability listed, as it occurs at all income, social, and demographic levels	Disability is included in the national definition of transportation disadvantaged (see Transportation Research Board and Smart Growth America). This goal is intended to discuss equal distribution amongst all populations, however, prioritizing certain areas that contain transportation disadvantaged populations. To clarify this section, we added language to say transportation disadvantaged within <i>underserved areas</i>	Clarified text throughout section	
Policy 5.2	Replace 'Encourage' with 'Require'	After further review of this section we noticed redundancies of language and intent. Section has been revised to combine and clarify the Goal area	Frist draft Policy 5.2 and Strategy 5.2A were combined language with Policy 5.1 - they are renumbered accordingly for this revised draft	
Strategy 5.2A	Replace 'Encourage' with 'Require'	After further review of this section we noticed redundancies of language and intent. Section has been revised to combine and clarify the Goal area	Frist draft Policy 5.2 and Strategy 5.2A were combined language with Policy 5.1 - they are renumbered accordingly for this revised draft	
Strategy 6.1G	What is meant by 'further justify'	Intent was to link health and safety improvements. Since strategy did not result in an 'action' moved the discussion on linkages to chapter 2	Deleted strategy and added language to "health" benefits section in Chapter 2	
Goal 7	Can we expand this section	Language in Chapter 2 is intended to further address sustainability within the Plan. While other policies and strategies also support sustainability, staff could not identify other actions to include within Goal 7	No change made	
7.1A	How are 'software applications' and e-bikes/mobility devices in the same category? Address the need to minimize potential conflicts between e-bikes and other powered mobility devices with pedestrian and non powered bicycle uses	This is an all encompassing strategy focused on getting more people to walk or bike. Software applications include trip planning websites, and traveler information that aid in mode choice, while e-bikes and other mobility devices (e.g. Segways) make it easier for some to use these routes  The safe operation of devices like e-bikes is covered in Strategy 1.2E	No change made	
Goal 8	What about a policy that directs greater flexibility in restriping and how we consider cross sections (e.g. start at three travel lanes before examining four)	Strategy 1.1B calls for identifying roadway cross sections from a multimodal perspective, taking into account several different factors. This should help to assess how many lanes may be appropriate given a particular context. Contexts must be assessed as what may be the right solution in one area will not work in another  In addition, this could be something to discuss in the Oregon Highway Plan update, regarding classifications and design practices	No change made	
Goal 8	CMAQ funds should not be spent on capacity expansion, but instead be used for biking and walking investments	Decisions about use of CMAQ funds is a specific funding program that needs further discussion outside of planning effort.	No change made	
Policy 8.2	Why call out "recreation" in the <i>elaborate</i> category and why "pedestrian and bicycle only bridges," since these may be essential	The intent of Policy 8.2 is to help prioritize the different types of bicycle and pedestrian investments and recognize that all types are important. Strategy 8.2A emphasizes safety and critical connections as the highest need. Recreation is important but may be lower priority than connecting a neighborhood to a school, for example, and while a bike/ped bridge may be needed it is more costly than other alternatives. However, 8.2A is not an exclusive hierarchy as explained in the call-out box, meaning if a bike-ped bridge is deemed essential it can be added to the project list	No change made	
Policy 8.2	Find ways to use existing infrastructure for bicycle and pedestrian use (e.g. railways or old bridges)	Strategy 8.2C attempts to cover this  In addition, the Rail Plan includes strategy language on rail banking for rails to trails. The new Legal Context appendix for this Bike-Ped Plan explains this cross-over and how the plans relate	No change made	
<b>Chapter 4</b>				
Page 54	Remove 'local' from first sentence of ConnectOregon section		Deleted	
Page 54	Connect Oregon no longer does loans		Deleted	
Page 57, Table 2	Needs explained. Trails are not included. Does the 'miles needed' mean lane miles and is the % percent of total	Table title explains that miles are roadside (not lane miles), and those needed are 'highways in cities and urban areas', and percent complete is the difference between the numbers	Modified table headings to clarify	

Plan Location	PAC Member Comment	Considerations	Responding Edit	PAC Member Notes
Page 58, third paragraph	The statement "beyond this plan..." infers that ADA and the Bike Bill are not included in this plan	Wording should have said "in addition to this plan," as the intent was to talk about all things that influence decision making: this plan AND laws	Modified language	
Page 63, first paragraph	Defining the System' sounds like the industry does not know what types of bike and pedestrian design elements are needed and when, when there is actually a lot known	Intent was to highlight the need for consistent application and that the 'right' treatment is used	Modified language	
Page 64 (Scenarios)	Provide example projects to help illustrate scenarios	Project costs can vary widely between projects and over the plan horizon. Kept general examples of what kinds of projects could be included in each scenario	No change made	
Page 64 (Scenarios)	Include in the scenarios section the option of using different funding mechanisms (i.e. opt in programs) to increase funds for walking and biking	The funding scenarios describe the investment outlook with different amounts of money. Therefore, it is inclusive of funding mechanisms, grants, etc. but does not presuppose what they are	No change made	
Page 67	Add scenario 5 that defines vision and goals and finds new ways to fund the bicycle and pedestrian vision for the state	Total funding need for walking and biking facilities is far greater than what is illustrated in scenario 4. However, this scenario focuses on the \$2.5b as a figure more achievable over the 25 year Plan horizon. Scenario 3 and 4 do include the expectation of additional funding, with scenario 3 assuming additional funding sources similar to special circumstances in years past and scenario 4 assuming new dedicated funding scenarios	Added examples to Strategy 8.1A to provide examples of possible new funding mechanisms	
<b>Chapter 5</b>				
General	What is the process for local jurisdiction plan development - provide an outline in the Plan to address local process		This is included in the Legal Context appendix and is included in the packet materials	
General	Need clarity on how freight routes tie into this Plan		Added how modal plans tie into the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan in Legal Context appendix, including the Freight, Rail, TO, Highway, and Transit Plans	
Page 70	Who is responsible for ADA transition plans	Transportation agencies, ODOT was used as an example	No change	
Page 75 - last bullet, left column	Options is misspelled		Corrected	
Page 76	Under demographic trends the language does not match the strength of earlier chapters (such as the use of 'may')		Modified wording - change "may" increase demand to "will"	
Page 77	Who is responsible (and has the authority) to implement the Plan is not clear		Added a sentence to illustrate local compliance	
Page 78	Clarify key initiatives language to better explain their intent	The next steps section was revised to clarify the intent of key initiatives and how the Plan moves forward after adoption	Revised	
Page 78	Key initiatives are not instructive, need to identify what key items need to occur to carry the Plan forward	The next steps section was revised to clarify the intent of key initiatives and how the Plan moves forward after adoption	Revised	
Page 78	Section does not flow adequately		Revised section	
<b>Appendices</b>				
B	Do not include 'District' after 'Salem-Keizer Transit'		Revised	
B	Mike Jaffee is the MWVCOG Transportation Planning Director		Revised	
F	*Related to questions about Plan authority	For this planning effort, staff completed the Legal Context component prior to OTC public review to help address questions related to Plan authority	New appendix	