

# Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Policy Advisory Committee Meeting #4 Summary

Tuesday, August 27, 2014 1:00 p.m.–4:00 p.m.

Location: ODOT Region 4 Office, Diamond & Crater Rooms, 63055 N Hwy 97, Bend, OR

## Committee Members Present

Tammy Baney (Chair), *Oregon Transportation Commission*

Craig Campbell, *AAA Oregon/Idaho*

Noel Mickelberry\*, *Oregon Walks*

Gerik Kransky, *Bicycle Transportation Alliance*  
(alternate for Dennis Mulvihill)

Jerry Breazeale, *Rural Oregon representative*

Peter Fernandez\*, *City of Salem*

Sid Leiken, *Lane County Commission*

Bob Russell, *Oregon Trucking Associations*

Jenna Stanke, *Oregon Bike/Ped Advisory Committee, Jackson County*

Steve Dickey, *Salem-Keizer Transit District*

Jerry Norquist, *Cycle Oregon*

Sally Russell, *Bend City Council*

## Committee Members Absent

Chris DiStefano, *Rapha*

Bob Joondeph, *Disability Rights Oregon*

Mark Labhart, *Tillamook County Commission*

Dan Thorndike, *Medford Fabrication*

Phil Warnock, *Cascades West COG*

## ODOT Staff Present

Savannah Crawford, *Principal Planner*

Stephanie Millar, *Senior Planner*

Amanda Pietz, *Transportation Planning Unit Manager*

Sheila Lyons, *Bike/Ped Program Manager*

Mac Lynde, *Active Transportation Section Manager*

Jerri Bohard, *Transportation Development Division Administrator*

Gary Farnsworth, *Region 4 Area Manager*

Joni Bramlett, *Regional Transit Coordinator*

## Consultants Present

Peter Lagerwey, *Consultant Project Manager–Toole Design Group*

Steve Pickrell\*, *Cambridge Systematics*

Susie Wright, *Kittelson & Associates*

Jeanne Lawson, *Facilitator–JLA Public Involvement*

Jamie Harvie, *JLA Public Involvement*

## Members of Public Present

Wayne Baum, *OBPAC*

Jeff Munson, *Commute Options/OBPAC*

Lee Shoemaker, *OBPAC*

Evan McKenzie, *OBPAC*

Lynne Mutrie, *Safe Routes to Schools*

Joel Wanamaker, *Oregon State Parks*

---

\*Attended by phone

## Key Meeting Outcomes

---

The PAC:

- Established working versions of the Vision and Goals
- Reviewed and provided input on the Issues and Opportunities Memo
- Brainstormed policy discussion themes
- Received a short briefing on the proposed purpose and approach for the Business Case White Paper

Action Items:

- Committee members should send any additional input on the Issues and Opportunities Memo or Business Case White Paper concept to Savannah Crawford over the next couple weeks.
- Committee members should attend upcoming listening meetings if possible and encourage their constituents to attend.
- A link to the virtual listening meeting will be sent to committee members.

## Meeting Summary

---

### Welcome and Introductions

Commissioner Tammy Baney, PAC Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting and the committee and audience members introduced themselves. Savannah Crawford introduced herself as the new ODOT Project Manager for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

Jeanne Lawson explained that the primary purpose of meeting was to lay the foundation for the next meeting, at which point the work will begin on developing policies. This will include: establish a working version of the Vision and Goals; discuss opportunities and challenges to walking and biking in Oregon, and begin discussions on building policy themes.

Amanda Pietz said that, since the previous meeting, the project team has worked on the issues and opportunities memo and formed the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The TAC has met twice and has reviewed and approved the Business Case White Paper approach.

### Review 4-15-14 Meeting Summary

The PAC approved the 4-15-14 meeting summary by consensus.

### PAC Member Report Outs

PAC members reported on who they have spoken with about the Plan and any issues and concerns the group should be aware of. Members described conversations with ACTs, City Councils and County Commissions, advisory committees, and other groups where they discussed aspects of the Plan and plan development process.

### Update on Vision and Goals

Jeanne Lawson and Savannah Crawford began by pointing out that, based on the online survey of the members, there appeared to be broad support for the Vision and Goals. The committee members had very few comments. Savannah said the project team has considered this input and presented a revised Vision and Goals. She explained that the project team is seeking approval of the Vision and Goals to use as working versions moving forward. The committee will have a chance to revisit the Vision and Goals after the policy discussion in six to eight months.

## *Vision*

- Suggestions to the working draft included:
  - Better address the issue of “comfort.” Some committee members felt that a “sense of safety” does not adequately cover the concept of a personal feeling of comfort. Some committee members thought the word “comfort” was unclear, and noted committee discussion of that at the previous meeting.
  - Qualify the term “contribution” to make it clear it means a “positive contribution.”
  - Clarify that “transportation system” refers to the statewide transportation system. Concern that this could be taken for the active transportation system if the mode plan is read separately from the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP).
  - Add “interconnected” to the phrase “recognized as integral elements of the transportation system.”
- *Outcome:* PAC members agreed to accept the current Vision as a working version and to revisit these recommendations at a later stage.

## *Goal: Mobility and Efficiently*

- The term “direct route” was removed because the direct route may not always be the safest or most appropriate. Chairperson Baney provided the example of the Bend Parkway, which is direct but dangerous for bicyclists.
  - Many committee members expressed concerned about removing the term “direct route.” Reasons included:
    - The direct route is frequently the route a person using active transportation would use even if this is not the intention. This is particularly true with pedestrians.
    - Specifying the direct route helps with planning processes. Including it can lead to better outcomes.
    - Bicyclists and pedestrians should be able to choose the most direct route as equal users of the transportation system.
  - Chairperson Baney noted that the direct route was not always reasonable or safe and provided examples. She was also concerned that it was not clear enough.
  - One committee member expressed concern that lack of clarity around the term direct route could be a deterrent to local development.
  - A number of committee members thought that safety should be paramount. They could support inclusion of the “direct route” wording, because safety is discussed previously as the clear priority.
  - “Efficient” was suggested as alternate wording. Members noted that was already in the title.
- *Outcome:* The Goal will remain with the term “direct route” for the working draft; the topic of direct routes will be added to the Issues and Opportunities memo and explored further in the policy discussion. Two committee members felt uncomfortable leaving it out in the working draft; other committee members agreed pending a later discussion.

## *Goal: Accessibility and Connectivity*

- Chairperson Baney suggested that the idea of “direct route” may fit better under this Goal.
  - Change “connect” to “connects.”
- *Outcome:* This suggestion will be revisited following the policy discussions.

### *Goal: Community & Economic Vitality*

- Suggested changes to the working Goal included:
  - Add “other destinations” because jobs and businesses are not the only places people travel to.
  - Change the second sentence to read “Enhanced high quality biking and walking systems will attract visitors, new residents, and new business to the state, opening new opportunities for Oregonians” in order to emphasize it is the high quality system which results in those benefits.
- *Outcome:* These changes will be made to the working version of the Goal.

### *Goal: Equity*

- Delete “such as public transportation” so as not to call out one particular transportation option. “Transportation options” will be defined in a glossary in the plan, which will be consistent with the other modal plans and the OTP.
- One committee member said that the importance of connecting the active transportation system to public transportation should be reflected somewhere, though not necessarily within the Goal definition.
- One committee member was concerned that the word “choice” does not sound sufficient; she thought the Goal should specify “basic needs.” Another committee member suggested that meeting the broader ambition of “choice” would then also mean serving “basic needs.” This topic was tabled for later discussion.
- *Outcome:* “Such as public transportation” will be removed from the working version of the Goal. Other suggestions will be revisited.

The other Goals were approved as working drafts without changes.

## **Issues and Opportunities Memo Overview**

Peter Lagerwey presented key information from the Issues and Opportunities report. He noted that the information in this document is observations, not recommendations, and that the document will be revised as the planning process goes on. He said the memo is based on the Existing Conditions Review, what was heard during stakeholder interviews, and industry best practices. Amanda Peitz noted that the Issues and Opportunities memo will be the starting piece for the policy discussion.

### *Safety*

- The group discussed the Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS) program. One committee member felt that “establish a SRTS program at every elementary and middle school in Oregon” was too strong of a statement. Peter said the statement was based on the passion that was discovered during the research; whether it should be included in the plan will be determined during the policy discussion. Funding for the SRTS program was discussed, which varies from a national to state level. Peter said that SRTS funding was identified as an issue because of uncertainty created by the program becoming optional under MAP 21, however Oregon has continued to fund the program.

### *Mobility & Efficiency*

- One committee member suggested the need to be more inclusive of various modes, giving the example of skateboarding as a transportation option. The project team said the term “walking routes” in the Vision is intended to be inclusive, however this is something worth further consideration by the committee in the policy discussion.

### *Accessibility & Connectivity*

- Suggestions included:
  - “Funding sources” should be changed to “funding mechanisms” because there are various opportunities to complete sidewalk infill projects apart from identifying funding sources.
  - “Investigate ways to improve policy and funding support for bicycle safety and connections on State Highways as they cross jurisdictional boundaries” should be expanded to include all transportation facilities, since this issue could exist on any facility in the state and this mode plan is for more than just state highways.

### *Community & Economic Vitality*

- One committee member said that active transportation facilities can help attract people to a community by making it a place they would like to live or work. This should be another focus in addition to economic benefits of tourism. The project team said they have tried to capture this concept in the memo and it will also be revisited in the Business Case White Paper and in the policy discussion.
- One committee member said that local street and state highway overlaps need to be addressed.

### *Equity*

- This section would be the appropriate place to specifically include considering and addressing issues of race, color, national origin.

### *Health*

- The committee discussed the connection of mental health to this category. Mental health is included because of the connection of the brain to the body and also research showing the benefits of fresh air and exercise to improved mental health.

### *Sustainability*

- The committee discussed the term “sustainability.” The definition needs to be made clear because the term can have a broad range of interpretations, which could be positive or negative.
- This has been captured as something to be discussed moving forward.

### *Strategic Investment*

- Suggestions included:
  - Emphasize that the aim is improved funding for the entire transportation system and also for active transportation to have equal access to transportation funding.
  - Explore how to best fund active transportation projects when they compete with other projects in grant programs and also how to best sell active transportation projects within larger project packages.
  - Consider how to prioritize the value of active transportation projects.
  - Address the challenge that active transportation systems are fragmented because they are often included as part of larger projects.
  - Explore how to approach active transportation improvements in rural versus urban areas.

### *Coordination, Cooperation & Collaboration*

- One member noted the project team hopes to make a connection between what works at a policy level and what works on the ground, as well as cooperation between and within jurisdictions.

The project team encouraged committee members to provide any additional feedback to Savannah Crawford following the meeting. The team would like to receive feedback within two weeks.

### **Policy Themes Discussion**

Amanda Pietz said the next PAC meeting will be a workshop format to begin developing policies. The committee participated in a roundtable exercise to identify major themes that should be discussed. Themes included:

- Direct routes
- Infill projects
- Consideration of sub-mode users (segways, electric bikes, skateboards, etc.)
- Data for decision-making
- Maintenance (paving, sweeping, preserving, etc.)
- Safety with separation versus shared facilities
- Vision 0 (goal of no crashes or deaths)
- Funding, including dedicated funding
- Simplicity of implementation and resource identification
- Recreation/transportation
- Complete streets and highways
- Identify and break down jurisdictional barriers
- Consider all of Oregon – rural/urban
- Flexible standards for rural areas
- Facilities appropriate for all ages (8–80)
- Equal consideration amongst all modes
- System connectivity, including connections to transit
- Prioritize maintenance investments
- Redevelopment
- Education
- Identify system barriers
- Education and enforcement around safety
- Methods for prioritizing projects, including data and performance measures
- Planning for tomorrow without being constrained by today

### **Business Case White Paper**

Steve Pickerel discussed the proposed purpose and approach for the Business Case White Paper. Its purpose is to identify potential benefits of active transportation infrastructure investments, provide a greater understanding of potential benefits and contributing factors, and establish common language and parameters for discussing benefits. The paper will consider the difference between economic impacts and economic valuation, direct versus indirect benefits, responses that are needed in order to generate benefits, geographic scale, and overlapping benefits.

Amanda Pietz noted that the Business Case White Paper will not provide specific numbers around the economic benefits of active transportation, but instead give a sense of the order of magnitude of the contribution of active transportation on the state system. She explained that the TAC has already reviewed and approved the approach outlined in the Business Case White Paper. She asked PAC members to provide any input or suggestions for information sources to Savannah Crawford.

## Public Comment

Lynne Mutrie said she appreciated the PAC's work. She encouraged prioritizing SRTS projects and suggested that funding be allocated to both the engineering and educational aspects of the program. She encouraged the committee to revisit the safety Goal because starting with "injuries and fatalities" does not encourage people to start using active transportation.

Jeff Munson asked committee members who are on both the Bike/Ped and Transportation Options plan committees to try to blend the efforts of two committees. He supported the goal of having the SRTS program in all schools in Oregon. He said that active transportation facilities are not extra amenities but they are a real transportation option, which should play into funding priorities. He said the plan should tie in *why* ODOT wants people to use active transportation. He would like to see "great places to live" being an emphasis. He agrees that facilities should be separated whenever possible but noted that people who use active transportation have the same destinations as motorists so combined facilities are also important. He supported using the term "efficient" in place of "direct routes."

## Next Steps

Jeanne Lawson reviewed the next steps in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan process. It was noted that the meeting packet includes a schedule for the various parts of the plan.

- A series of five listening meetings will be held around the state in August and September to hear from practitioners and the public on key policy issues that relate to walking and biking in Oregon. Committee members should attend a meeting if possible and encourage their constituents to attend.
- A virtual listening meeting is also available for those unable to attend in person:  
[http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/Pages/bpoh\\_welcome.aspx](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/Pages/bpoh_welcome.aspx).
- The next PAC meeting will be held October 28 in Salem and will begin the policy discussion.
- Next month, the project team will present an update on the plan to the OTC.

Tammy thanked everyone for their commitment to the project and closed the meeting.