

# **Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Policy Advisory Committee Meeting #5 Summary**

**Tuesday, October 28, 2014 1:00 p.m.–4:00 p.m.**

**Location: Chemeketa Center for Business and Industry, Room 115, 626 High Street NE, Salem OR**

## **Committee Members Present**

Tammy Baney (Chair), *Oregon Transportation Commission*

Jerry Breazeale\*, *Rural Oregon representative*

Chris DiStefano, *Rapha*

Noel Mickelberry, *Oregon Walks*

Peter Fernandez, *City of Salem*

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

Mark Labhart, *Tillamook 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**

Craig Campbell, *AAA Oregon/Idaho*

Bob Joondeph, *Disability Rights Oregon*

Sid Leiken, *Lane County Commission*

Dan Thorndike, *Medford Fabrication*

Phil Warnock, *Cascades West COG*

## **ODOT Staff Present**

Savannah Crawford, *Principle 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*

## **Consultants Present**

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

Jeanne Lawson, *Facilitator–JLA Public Involvement*

Jamie Harvie, *JLA Public Involvement*

## **Member of Public Present**

Evan McKensie, *OBPAC*

---

\*Attended by phone

## Key Meeting Outcomes

---

The Policy Advisory Committee (PAC):

- Received an update on work to date and the anticipated work schedule.
- Reviewed the proposed policy themes and completed an exercise to inform policy development.

Action Items:

- PAC members were encouraged to continue to communicate with their constituents regarding the planning process. The ODOT project team is able to provide outreach support or make presentations on request.
- PAC members should provide any additional feedback on the policy themes (for example, feedback that was too detailed for group discussion) to the project team.

## Meeting Summary

---

### Welcome and Introductions

PAC Chairperson, Tammy Baney, welcomed everyone to the meeting and talked about the public outreach the team has done since the last PAC meeting. The team has held five listening meetings and a virtual open house which included an online survey, drawing hundreds of participants. She congratulated the team on engaging the public early and said they plan to continue to engage them throughout the process.

Jeanne Lawson reviewed the agenda. She noted that there are a lot of policy items to work through and there will not be time to discuss every policy theme in depth. The meeting is structured to give the team a sense of which items most need discussion and which can be taken forward by the team to develop policy language to bring back to the group.

Jeanne introduced Noel Mickelberry of Oregon Walks.

### Review 10-27-14 Meeting Summary

The PAC accepted the 10-27-14 meeting summary by consensus.

### PAC Member Report Outs

PAC members reported on who they had spoken with about the plan and any issues and concerns the group should be aware of. Members mentioned recent updates to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) and the Oregon Public Transportation Conference, and participation in the International Mountain Biking Association Summit.

Jeanne said that the project team would like to encourage PAC members to communicate as much as possible with their constituents and that the team is able to provide outreach support or make presentations on request.

### Schedule Check-In

Savannah Crawford reviewed progress since the last PAC meeting and the anticipated schedule for upcoming meetings. An anticipated project schedule was included in the meeting packet. The project team has made minor changes to the Vision and Goals based on input from the PAC. Savannah has kept a tracked changes version, which can be provided on request.

Feedback from all outreach done to date has been compiled into the list of policy themes in the meeting packet.

Based on PAC input on the policy themes, the project team will begin developing policy language. The policy discussion will continue to happen over many months. In December/January, the project team hopes to bring some draft policy wording for PAC review. In January/February, the project team would like to begin discussing strategies, and funding and implementation with the PAC.

## **Refining Policy Themes**

Amanda Pietz prefaced the policy themes discussion saying that PAC feedback on the themes will help determine whether a particular issue area is ready for staff efforts to develop policy language. She emphasized that the purpose of today's exercise is not so much about whether they "like" or "dislike" the issue, but whether committee members believe more discussion is needed before drafting policy language.

Jeanne explained that the policy themes are a compilation of information from the entire process to date, including initial stakeholder interviews, PAC conversations, discussions by the TAC, recent interviews by Peter, the listening meetings and the on-line open house.

### *Discussion*

- One PAC member noted that the quantity of themes is somewhat overwhelming and wondered whether they would be consolidated at some point. Amanda said that today is about the PAC providing input on a comprehensive list of potential topics so the project team can refine where the focus should be. Some items in the list may be strategies rather than policies – the team will sort this out later on.
- A PAC member asked what the connection is between policy themes and the wording in the issues/opportunities report. Savannah said that the list of policy themes is a compilation of everything the project team has heard during their outreach. The issues/opportunities will be revisited later on as a checkpoint to make sure the policies have covered everything they intended to.
- Another PAC member asked whether PAC members should make suggestions in regards to blending/consolidating themes. Jeanne said that today's focus is on the substance of the themes rather than their groupings. She asked PAC members to take note of all their suggestions (including gaps, combinations, etc.) and follow up with the project team with that information.
- One PAC member said that this level of language is best kept to policy language rather than design guidelines. She suggested that the project team focus on which part of these themes are suited for policy. Savannah noted that the plan will not get into the level of detail of engineering design standards, however there may be appropriate policy language that could guide design standards. Amanda said that the goal is to develop a balance of policies that work broadly. At the same time, they want to have policies that are not so general as to be meaningless. She said that it is likely that some policies may stay higher level while some may go deeper.
- Jeanne noted that the project team expects as they work with an issue to further develop recommendations on whether the themes are suitable for policy or to be included in some other way, such as strategies. Today's objective is to have the committee weigh in on whether the theme is important to address in the plan, rather than necessarily how it should be addressed.

## **Policy Exercise**

PAC members were asked to familiarize themselves with the proposed policy themes prior to the meeting. Informed by their review and the presentation, PAC members were asked to assign a color (red, yellow, green) based upon the level of discussion they think is necessary:

- Green – Yes. The project team should address this theme and the theme is clear enough that staff can move forward to draft policy language.

- Yellow – Not sure. This theme may need further discussion but is probably okay to draft policy language.
- Red – No. We really need further discussion on this before drafting policy language.

Peter Lagerwey presented the policy themes.

Peter presented the information one theme at a time and described each bulleted item under the theme. After presentation of a theme area and the elements within that theme, the team responded to clarification questions and then asked the committee to indicate whether the theme needed further discussion or if the team could begin drafting policy by raising their red, yellow or green signs. [See Appendix 1.]

The following were some of the key clarifying questions:

- “Enforce safety laws for all users of the transportation network. Consider all forms of safety enhancement treatments, ranging from low- to high-cost solutions; dependent on the need and location.”
  - A committee member asked why these two concepts had been combined. Peter responded that this was the way they had heard it from the public. The committee recommended splitting it into two different themes. They then indicated red, yellow or green for each part.
  - The committee wondered whether a state policy on enforcing safety laws should direct local governments and how it could be enforced. The team replied that the exact way this is incorporated into the plan is still to be decided; they would like to hear from the committee on whether it is an important issue to carry forward.
- The committee asked how the Maintenance category fits in with a high-level policy plan.
  - Peter pointed out that – particularly with the Maintenance category – the public tended to get into the detail of issues that were important to them. It will be the project team’s job to raise these considerations to a higher level.
  - Jeanne said that many of these issues affect the bicycling experience so much that people find it hard to separate it from a policy discussion.
  - A committee member pointed out that this section contains themes regarding both routine maintenance and larger maintenance issues.
- “Consider bicycle and pedestrian facility needs during preservation/paving projects by assuring an adequate shoulder or grade (e.g. chip seal).”
  - The committee asked whether this relates to what happens while maintenance is being done or the result of the maintenance. The team clarified that it relates to the final result of the maintenance activity. The engineering category contains some themes regarding bike/ped considerations during construction.
  - A committee member asked how chip seal relates to this theme. The team replied that it would be to consider how chip seal is used, e.g. the size of stones or boundary of the chip seal with the roadway, which effects user experience.
  - A committee member pointed out that this theme addresses a loophole from the bike/ped bill that was passed.
- “Develop more flexible design standards for various parts of the state to assist in the incorporation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.”
  - The project team clarified the flexible design standards theme would be focused on allowing flexibility to suit communities of different sizes and in different geographic areas.
- “Accommodate and design for a multitude of travel ‘devices’ on bicycle and pedestrian facilities (e.g. Segway’s, electric bikes, skateboards, etc.).”

- A committee member asked whether this was mandating specific treatments for all facilities. The team specified that this is a level of detail that still needs to be considered, though they recognized that not all facilities are appropriate for all places.
- Project Coordination in Construction
  - A committee member said that the topic of worksite safety seems to be outside the scope of this plan. The team clarified that this came up in regards to alternative routes not always being advertised during construction projects. The Oregon City Bridge was provided as an example of a project that provided information and shuttles due to the significant detour.
  - Savannah noted that two themes address two related things: the first theme deals with providing viable alternate routes and the second is about providing sufficient and consistent signage and outreach regarding alternate routes.

Some of the comments brought up during the clarifying questions were more substantive comments rather than clarifying; those comments are documented in the discussion section below.

#### *Discussion*

The group began their discussion by addressing the three categories with the most elements that group members indicated with a need to discuss. These were: Development/Redevelopment or Land Use; Funding and Implementation; and Safety. They also provided select comments on several other themes (Maintenance; Engineering; Project Coordination in Construction), though did not discuss them in depth.

Commissioner Baney said she feels that this list of themes sets the tone well for the state of Oregon as a whole, but in further development, the team will need to consider distinguishing between aspirational items and policy items. While the plan will be used by the OTC as a policy document, it could pose difficulties for local jurisdictions if it is too prescriptive.

Note: The following discussion does not represent group consensus, but rather issues raised by specific members.

#### **Development/Redevelopment or Land Use**

- Overall
  - Want to be aspirational and provide guidance but to do so in a collaborative way.
  - The first two and second two themes for this category are different. The first two (incorporating bike/ped elements into new development, and coordinating land use decisions) have to do with coordination and should use a tone that encourages collaboration between jurisdictions. The second two (regarding school siting, and density requirements) may not belong in a policy plan.
  - Need a balanced approach that does not become a mandate to local jurisdictions later on.
  - Policies in the plan will tell ODOT what to do, but the document is not about ODOT mandates to other jurisdictions, but rather guidance.
  - Do not water down policies so much at the plan will not affect change.
  - Include policies and best practices; policies are the bare minimum and best practices the ultimate goal.
- “Locate schools more centrally for increased biking and walking access (Oregon School Siting Handbook).”
  - Not appropriate to mandate this.
  - Include as a consideration during school siting; provide information that helps present the impacts on operation costs and on the transportation system.
  - Extend the school siting theme to include all locations of other public services.

- Decisions on school siting must be based on data.
- Must be written in local code to be brought up during the school district’s siting processes.
- The state has an interest in school siting because they provide student transportation cost reimbursements.

**Funding and Implementation**

- “Develop data driven approaches to support funding of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.”
  - Concerned that data is not yet robust enough to support decisions.
  - Data needs to be consistent; need to be able to compare apples to apples.
  - Should include return on investment information.
  - Existing data may not be relevant to the argument that infrastructure, once built, will be used.
  - Could provide examples of similar situations and how it could apply/what kinds of return on investment might be seen.
- “Seek dedicated funding sources, or flexibility, for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and maintenance investments.”
  - The trucking industry would not want this in the policy if funding flexibility refers to the highway fund. It should come from dedicated funding.
  - The amount of dedicated funding is usually not sufficient to do much; need to fund by priority.
- “Consider prioritizing large maintenance and construction projects based on how well they incorporate bicycle and pedestrian facilities (and those with higher use rates).”
  - This may not always work or make sense for all projects.
  - This should be a factor to consider, not the primary consideration.
  - Transportation need should be the primary consideration.
  - Consider shifting focus to “when part of a planned system.”
  - Sometimes funds may be better spent on off system facilities.

**Safety**

- Overall:
  - Consider sight lines, speed and lane widths next to bike lanes.
- “Enforce safety laws for all users of the transportation network.”
  - Needing to enforce laws is self-evident; what needs to be defined is how to better enforce safety laws.
  - Recommendations for how to better enforce safety laws could be presented in a white paper.
  - This seems to be a local concern.

**Maintenance [Substance comments raised during clarifying discussion]**

- Overall
  - Many of the maintenance activities mentioned are required through other programs and policies, such as stormwater permits.
- “Remove/sweep seasonal applications when no longer needed, such as gravel used for de-icing roadways.”
  - Add “maintain vegetation and condition of sidewalks” to the theme about sweeping.

**Engineering [Substance comment raised during clarifying discussion]**

- The focus of “Consistent development of bicycle/pedestrian facilities” should be on equitable distribution of projects across the State.

## **Public Comment**

Evan McKenzie requested clarification about flexible design standards for rural areas. Evan was concerned that this could provide a loophole that would exempt rural areas from improving their bicycle/pedestrian system. He said that small rural towns should be areas where biking and walking is very viable and would not like to see these areas able to continue with a status quo that does not fit this vision.

Three written public comments – from Gary Shaff, Mark Wigg, and Metro – were distributed to the committee and are included as an appendix.

## **Next Steps**

Jeanne told committee members those policy themes that were given primarily “green” votes and those that had been discussed by the PAC at this meeting would be taken away by the project team for further consideration and development. Several policy themes that were flagged for further discussion would be brought for PAC discussion at the next meeting. She encouraged committee members to provide written comments to the team on all elements that they had indicated needed discussion but that had not been discussed today.

At the next meeting, the project team plans to present draft policy language on a few of the themes identified as “green” and to provide an opportunity to discuss whether there are gaps in policy themes, in addition to discussing the remaining flagged policy themes.

Some of the policy themes that need clarification may also be considered by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) prior to the next PAC meeting.

The next PAC meeting will be held on November 18 in Springfield. [Note: this meeting has been canceled.]

Commissioner Baney said she appreciates the PAC’s help in getting the right balance between being courageous and being relevant and adjourned the meeting.

## Appendix 1: Policy Themes Exercise

The purpose of this exercise is to help frame the conversation at our next PAC meeting. At our meeting we will discuss each of the themes, have you assign a 'color,' and spend the remaining time focusing on those items that need further discussion. Prior to the meeting, please use this sheet to review each of the Policy Themes below and assign them a color. The notes column is for you to note any discussion points or questions you want to bring up. Please bring this with you to the October 28 meeting.



**Green** – Yes. We should address this & I feel it is clear enough that staff can move forward and draft policy language to bring back to the PAC.



**Yellow** – Not sure. This may need further discussion but is probably okay to draft policy language.



**Red** – No. We really need further discussion on this before drafting policy language.

### Safety

### Number of PAC votes

Increase the visibility and awareness of bicyclists and pedestrians through enhancements such as lighting, flashing beacons, flags, moving the stop bar back etc.	11	1	0
Enhance personal security in order to encourage use of alternate modes by providing 'eyes on the street' enhancements, such as lighting, appropriate landscaping and maintenance.	10	2	0
Enforce safety laws for all users of the transportation network.	7	2	3
Consider all forms of safety enhancement treatments, ranging from low- to high-cost solutions; dependent on the need and location.	11	1	0
Consider system users and demographics when accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians.	11	1	0
Examine options for setting posted speeds on roadways dependent on multiple users of the system.	7	4	1
Consider vulnerable users of the system when planning facilities or facility improvements. Consider separated facilities where feasible and appropriate to provide added level of comfort among users.	11	0	1
Adopt the 'Vision Zero' goal of no deaths or injuries resulting from traffic crashes.	10	2	0
Include safety improvements for bicyclists and pedestrians in all transportation projects and programs.	7	4	1

Assign “safety” (all modes) a high value when prioritizing transportation projects.	6	4	2
---	---	---	---

### Network Connectivity and Intermodal Connectivity

#### Number of PAC votes

Explicitly consider ways to connect underserved and transportation disadvantaged populations to the bicycle transportation network.	10	2	0
Prioritize filling system gaps (pedestrian and bike facilities) in areas that are served by high activity areas, such as schools and, shopping centers.	12	0	0
Facilitate first- and last-mile connections to other modes.	10	2	0
Examine opportunities to be more strategic about infill investments; recognizing that many investments today are opportunistic based on a funded road project, which may not be the area of greatest need for bike or pedestrian infill.	9	2	1
In rural areas which rely on local or state roadway shoulders for bicycle and pedestrian travel, seek opportunities to improve for cycle use where possible.	8	3	1
Improve connectivity of street grids in sub-divisions to provide better local connectivity for cyclists and pedestrians.	9	3	0
Improve wayfinding signage to encourage bicyclist and pedestrian use.	12		0
Where safe, provide the most direct routes between origins and destinations.	8	2	2

### Education and Outreach

#### Number of PAC votes

Educate all transportation users on the rules of the road.	12	0	0
Educate all users on safety, including helmet safety, use of crossing locations, hand signals, safe passing distance, etc.	11	0	1
Encourage youth to bike and walk for transportation and get them comfortable with cycling/walking at early ages (Safe Routes to Schools comes out often in this discussion).	6	5	1
Explore avenues for education and outreach including driver education, drivers manual and driver testing, Safe Routes to School, Transportation Options providers, etc.	11	0	1
Use data to dispel safety or conflict myths between transportation modes.	8	1	3
Provide information on the public health benefits of biking and walking to encourage more use.	10	1	1

**Development/Redevelopment (PAC) or Land Use****Number of PAC votes**

Incorporate bicycle/pedestrian elements in new development or redevelopment projects, such as incorporating or increasing bike parking.	10	1	1
Coordinate land use decisions with transportation providers.	7	3	2
Locate schools more centrally for increased biking and walking access (Oregon School Siting Handbook).	6	3	3
Where feasible, encourage more dense developments to promote biking and walking opportunities.	7	2	3

**Data****Number of PAC votes**

Employ data to guide decision making processes such as methods for prioritization and performance measures.	6	5	1
Collect and store data to better understand system users and their needs.	10	2	0
Identify predictive measures for use and safety of bicycling and walking routes.	10	1	1
Find opportunities to improve data collection, use, and storage through coordination or other methods.	10	1	1
Share data among transportation providers, with the health sector and other agencies as appropriate.	10	2	0
Develop mechanisms to improve bicycle and pedestrian crash data, especially in incidents that involve non-motorized users.	9	2	1
Explore ways technology can facilitate data collection and decision making.	10	2	0

**Maintenance (PAC)****Number of PAC votes**

Regularly sweep roadways and shoulders for non-motorized vehicle use, especially in high-use areas or locations with few other modal options.	10	2	0
Prioritize snow and ice removal in high-use areas or locations with few other modal options.	6	5	1
Remove/sweep seasonal applications when no longer needed, such as gravel used for de-icing roadways.	10	2	0
Consider bicycle and pedestrian facility needs during preservation/paving projects by assuring an adequate shoulder or grade (e.g. chip seal).	6	3	3
Consider context when locating rumble strips along highways, especially in areas where shoulder widths are narrow.	7	4	1

**Engineering****Number of PAC votes**

Design facilities for all ages ('8-80') to provide a level of comfort for all types of users.	7	3	2
Develop more flexible design standards for various parts of the state to assist in the incorporation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	7	4	1
Develop bicycle/pedestrian facilities more consistently across the State.	8	4	0
When possible, consider all transportation users (bicyclists and pedestrians in addition to drivers) when access spacing is considered along roadways and access management decisions are made.	8	3	1
Consider application of 'Complete Streets' on local roadways and highways.	10	2	0
When funding the construction of a transportation project, look for opportunities to provide a multi-use path, bike lanes or to widen shoulders.	10	1	1
Have equal consideration among all modes when developing projects.	4	7	1
Accommodate and design for a multitude of travel 'devices' on bicycle and pedestrian facilities (e.g. Segway's, electric bikes, skateboards, etc.).	8	3	1

**Interagency Collaboration****Number of PAC votes**

Collaborate with other departments and agencies in project development (transit stops connecting to sidewalks or bike lanes, etc.) to ensure that all modes are being considered in project development.	12	0	0
As projects develop, coordinate with adjacent jurisdictions on design and connectivity to remove jurisdictional barriers for project development.	12	0	0

**Project Coordination in Construction****Number of PAC votes**

Provide alternate bicycle/pedestrian detour routes in temporary work zones.	9	3	0
Incorporate bicycle/pedestrian signage during construction so detour routes are well marked.	11	1	0
Train all construction inspectors on ADA, bikeway, and walkway facility standards.	9	2	1

**Funding and Implementation****Number of PAC votes**

Seek dedicated funding sources, or flexibility, for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and maintenance investments.	9	1	2
Consider prioritizing large maintenance and construction projects based on how well they incorporate bicycle and pedestrian facilities (and those with higher use rates).	4	5	3
Develop data driven approaches to support funding of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	7	4	1

**Quality of Life**

**Number of PAC votes**

Enhance community health by promoting bicycling and walking through infrastructure improvements, education and encouragement programs in collaboration with local and state partners.	10	2	0
Draw a strong connection between bicycling and walking and sustainability, both environmentally and financially.	9	3	0
Utilize sustainability policy goals in encouraging bicycling and walking.	8	3	1

**Economic Vitality**

**Number of PAC votes**

Offer a balanced, connected transportation system that facilitates community vitality by encouraging active transportation for local trips and integrates with other transportation modes.	12	0	0
Consider the economic benefit of regional trails and other recreational facilities when prioritizing projects.	11	1	0

## Appendix 2: Written Public Comments

---

### Public Comment 1: Letter and email to Savannah Crawford, 10/27/14

Honorable Committee Members and staff,

I reviewed the draft goals and Issues/Opportunities Report accompanying the 10/28 agenda. They did not appear to address a fundamental question; will ODOT's highways in urban and metropolitan areas include bike lanes in the future. If the goals don't provide that kind of clear policy guidance, I would suggest that they should.

I'm quite frankly, surprised that such an issue would even need to be addressed considering the Transportation Planning Rule and ODOT's own Oregon Transportation Plan. However, the May 2014 draft OR99, Rogue Valley Highway Plan, excludes bike lanes on segments between Phoenix and Talent, and Talent and Ashland. This is particularly surprising since the Rogue Valley Highway serves to connect the cities of Ashland, Talent, Phoenix, Medford, and Central Point, and is a key bicycle commuter route. The Plan, by terminating bike lanes at city limits lines, would seem to suggest that interurban travel by bicycles should not be served except through multi-purpose shoulders or multi-use trails (with their circuitous routing, user conflicts, and limited speeds). As you may know, the physical characteristics of bike lanes and shoulders can be the same but the Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) extend to bike lanes (and the cyclists who use them) a unique set of protections and right-of-ways provisions that don't exist on road shoulders (see attached).

I would suggest that the draft goals (or policies – as those may be developed at some future meeting) be modified to include the following:

- 1) All non-interstate highway projects that include vehicle capacity additions or lane reconfigurations, except those involving traffic control device upgrade or installation where bike lanes are not otherwise present, shall include designated bike lanes (including related stencils, pavement markings and signs).
- 2) All state facilities, except for interstate highways, shall include bike lanes whenever there is adequate pavement width.
- 3) In urban areas the Department shall mark bike lanes as a part of any maintenance or marking project and, if necessary, seek a design exception for narrow bike lanes where pavements are too narrow for a six foot lane. When a design exception is not granted the lane markings shall include sharrows.
- 4) Pavement management projects shall always include the full width of the pavement unless the resulting bike lane / shoulder will be less smooth than the travel lane following the treatment.
- 5) Traffic Safety Division outreach and advertisements shall include efforts to explain the requirements of ORS 811.065.
- 6) Department of Motor Vehicle driver and CDL tests shall include a question related to ORS 811.065.

Has the Committee received a comprehensive inventory of bike lanes? If you do, I would encourage members to physically check "on the ground" the inventory to ensure that all "bike lanes" are marked correctly. A double line (an eight inch wide strip instead of four) is the proper marking for bike lanes according to the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Device (MUTCD). On a recent trip north I found many mismarked bike lanes (i.e. a four inch wide strip coupled with a bike and arrow stencil). The lack of knowledge or awareness about the required striping would appear to be widespread among many city, county and state highway officials. Is there a goal or policy to rectify this deficit?

Gary Shaff  
516 Herbert St  
Ashland, OR

Bike Lanes – Crosswalks for Cyclists  
By Gary Shaff, President

The Club's official comments on ODOT's Rogue Valley Highway OR99 Plan are available at [Siskiyouvelo.org](http://Siskiyouvelo.org).

A committee composed of David Chapman, Rees Jones, and I developed a draft statement that was reviewed and approved at the Club Board's September 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting. The comments are comprehensive. The Club's recommendations include 1) 3-lane cross sections instead of five where appropriate for the forecast traffic volumes, 2) reduction in speed limits, 3) provision of street lighting in urban sections of the corridor, 4) improved access to the Bear Creek Greenway, 5) phasing of the S. Stage to Phoenix section, and 6) designs to discourage wrong-way cyclists. In addition, the Club offered comments on each of the Plan's 21 improvement concepts.

An underlying issue in the Plan is whether bike lanes or shoulder striping will be used between the cities of Phoenix and Talent, and Talent and Ashland. The outcome of which will determine whether the Bear Creek Valley has an interconnected bicycle network or simply networks within each city. It is important to note that the Plan designates bike lanes between Medford and Phoenix – a good sign. It is also noteworthy that Crater Lake Highway includes bike lanes between Medford and Eagle Point.

ODOT, within the OR99 Plan, appears to be treating bike lanes as "urban facilities." Such a limited view ignores the importance of bicycles for interurban as well as urban travel.

Bike lanes are designated using an eight inch strip while shoulders receive a four inch. A four inch difference in striping width may not matter to some cyclists. However, that difference in width directly affects which laws are relevant. You may be familiar with the following laws (follow links for the complete text of the law):

[ORS 814.400](#) provides that bicycles, like automobiles, are classified as vehicles and can be operated in the roadway (i.e. travel lane).

[ORS 801.155](#) defines bicycle lane that part of the highway, adjacent to the roadway, designated by official signs or markings for use by persons riding bicycles except as otherwise specifically provided by law.

[ORS 801.480](#) defines road shoulder as that portion of a highway, whether paved or unpaved, contiguous to the roadway that is primarily for use by pedestrians, for the accommodation of stopped vehicles and for emergency use.

[ORS 814.430](#) requires cyclist to drive their bike as close as practicable to the right edge of the roadway except when a bike lane is present or when the lane is too narrow to safely share the lane with autos.

[ORS 811.425](#) requires drivers of slower vehicles to yield to overtaking vehicles; including moving the slower person's vehicle off the main traveled portion of the highway (i.e. onto the shoulder or an area suitable for turnout).

[ORS 811.065](#) requires motorists to pass people riding bicycles when there isn't a bike lane and speeds are greater than 35 MPH with enough "shy" distance (i.e. the distance between vehicles) to avoid hitting a cyclist if the cyclist fell into the lane.

[ORS 814.420](#) requires people riding bicycles to use a bike lane when present.

[ORS 811.050](#) requires auto drivers to yield to a rider in a bicycle lane.



State law provides greater legal protections and extends additional rights to cyclists in bike lanes as compared to roads with only shoulders. Autos are forbidden to use bike lanes. Additionally, auto drivers must yield to bicycles in bike lanes (i.e. the auto driver violates the law if they cause a collision when turning right across a bike lane). Taken together these laws create a special protected environment for people riding bikes in a bike lanes. It is not dissimilar to the way crosswalks serve to protect pedestrians.

In contrast, when a cyclist is using a road shoulder, the slower vehicle (i.e. the cyclist) must yield when overtaken by a faster moving motor vehicle. In the [State of Oregon v. Potter, 2002](#), the courts found that cyclists must use the shoulder or other turn-out, if safe, to avoid impeding motor vehicle traffic. If wide shoulders are available, they become de-facto bike lanes but without the right-of-way protections extended to cyclists under ORR811.050. Another disadvantage of roadways with shoulders compared to those with bike lanes, is that automobiles can be parked on shoulders.

For motorist, the absence of bike lanes (where speeds are greater than 35 MPH) complicates bicycling passing ; requiring specific shy distances as described in ORS 811.065, above. Most motorists aren't familiar with this law and as a consequence often violate the standards. The law went into effect in January 2008, long after most drivers on the road today took their drivers test. But driver ignorance doesn't diminish the requirements of law. The law effectively requires drivers to pull into the opposing (or adjacent lane) to pass a cyclist when a bike lane doesn't exist (unless speeds are less than 35 MPH). For example, travel lanes are typically 12 feet wide. A tall cyclist, even riding on the shoulder, would take roughly half of that width if they were to fall into the lane. To legally pass the cyclist, even one riding on the shoulder, a motorist would need to pull approximately half-way into the center turn lane (if one existed) or the opposing lane to pass. Motorist most often times pass cyclists at much closer distances. ORS 811.065 is probably one of the more frequently violated laws on the books. In this way, bike lanes offer something for both motorist and for people riding bicycles; providing more legal protections for cyclists while simplifying passing bicycles by motorists

No law prevents a careless driver/cyclist from a collision. But given Oregon laws, I'm a big fan of bike lanes. Additionally, bike lane stencils discourage wrong-way cycling which there are far too many. What's not to like?

## Public Comment 2: Email to Stephanie Millar, 9/24/14

Stephanie,

Please share this email with the Bike Ped Plan Advisory Committee.

The current bike-ped plan does not include an analysis of the hundreds of miles of short-line railroads that have been or are likely to soon be abandoned. ODOT currently has an advocacy group in the Rail Division that seeks to maintain freight lines. The state does not have an agency advocate that examines the benefits of converting the lines to trails. It relies on independent non-profit groups to quickly form to save rail r/w for trails. Maybe your group could start the statewide assessment of the marginal railroads to see if we should convert these lines to trails. We have spent over a hundred million of limited Connect Oregon dollars on improving rail lines and some of them are not moving freight. 2014 Rail Plan link here:

[http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/RailPlan/OTC0914/Oregon\\_SRP\\_Final\\_Draft\\_Sep2014\\_8-26-14.pdf](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/RailPlan/OTC0914/Oregon_SRP_Final_Draft_Sep2014_8-26-14.pdf)

Some of these rail lines could be very popular trails. For example, the Silverton to Stayton railroad has not carried any trains for years. It could be abandoned and sold to the neighbors, or if it became a rail to trail, it would serve thousands of people along the line and become a tourist destination. This is a transportation issue that your plan should address.

Thank you for your service to our State.

Mark Wigg  
p 503 588-2524  
c 971 600-6607  
P.O. Box 831  
Salem OR 97308

## Public Comment 3: Letter from Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

[www.oregonmetro.gov](http://www.oregonmetro.gov)



October 24, 2014

Savannah Crawford  
Transportation Development Division  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
555 13th Street NE, Salem, OR 97301

### Re: Input on policy development for the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

Dear Savannah:

Updating the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan provides an opportunity to refresh policies and actions that support achieving multiple goals such as reducing green house gas emissions, improving human and environmental health, providing transportation options, and connecting people to the places they need to go.

Metro supports this effort and regional transportation planning staff are participating in and following the update. We appreciate the work done to date by the project team, the Policy Advisory Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee on the draft vision and goals for the plan.

As the project team and Policy Advisory Committee move into the phase of developing policies and strategies that will implement the vision and goals, please consider the following input, derived primarily from lessons learned through development of the recently adopted the 2014 Regional Active Transportation Plan which was developed with extensive input from the region's counties, cities and key stakeholders.

1. Several of the draft goals reference the importance of high quality walking and bicycling routes to achieve desired outcomes. Consider policies and strategies that **support taking an innovative, flexible and robust approach to bicycle and pedestrian facility design** and encourage the adoption and use of resources such as the NACTO Urban Street Design and Urban Bikeway Design Guides.<sup>1</sup> The Federal Highway Administration's guidance memo on this topic supports these types of policies.<sup>2</sup>
2. To achieve goals related to mobility, connectivity, safety, equity, as well as others, consider policies and strategies that **provide direction on reconfiguring planned or existing roadways by narrowing or removing existing travel lanes** to allow for higher level of pedestrian and bicycle design. Recent case studies indicate that reconfiguring roadways to add protected bikeways, greater separation for pedestrians and shortened crossing distances can reduce crashes for all modes while maintaining mobility for auto travel.<sup>3,4,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> <http://nacto.org/>

<sup>2</sup> U.S. DOT FHWA Memorandum, Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Design

[https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/guidance/design\\_guidance/design\\_flexibility.cfm](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/design_guidance/design_flexibility.cfm)

<sup>3</sup> Protected Bicycle Lanes in NYC, September 2014. <http://www.nyc.gov/html/dot/downloads/pdf/2014-09-03-bicycle-path-data-analysis.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Rethinking Streets: An Evidence-Based Guide to 25 Complete Streets Transformations

<http://rethinkingstreets.com/>

<sup>5</sup> FHWA Proven Safety Countermeasures – “Road Diet” (Roadway Reconfiguration)

[http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped\\_bike/](http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/)

Though roadway reconfigurations are a proven practice, policy direction is needed at the state level in this area.

3. Consider policies and strategies that provide guidance on **updating safety and level of service performance measures** for planning and project development that measure performance for all modes of travel and not only motor vehicles. Provide guidance on other types of performance measures that are used for all modes (e.g. health, access).
4. Consider amendments to other modal or topical plans as a part of the scope of this project, where the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan identifies conflicts or needed clarifications in those other plans relative to the proposed Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Specifically, consider policy direction to **update and amend functional classifications in the Oregon Highway Plan** to reflect the multi-modal nature of many of the roadways in the Oregon Highway Plan, particularly Regional and District Highways. The Oregon Highway Plan is the only modal plan that includes policies on functional classification for the state roadway system, and this policy guides investment and management.<sup>6</sup>
5. Safety and health are themes referred to in the vision and goals. Consider policies and strategies that provide guidance on **crash reduction targets such as Vision Zero and proven countermeasures that improve safety and health for people walking and bicycling with a focus on arterial roadways**. In the Portland metropolitan region arterials have the highest serious crash rate for all modes. Improving safety on arterials is identified as a focus area in Metro's Regional Transportation Safety Plan.<sup>7</sup> Roadway design tools such as arterial traffic calming and roadway reconfigurations are proven safety countermeasures. Additionally, education and transportation demand management tools support converting drive trips to walking, bicycling and transit which reduce overall exposure of system users to motor vehicles.
6. A well-connected network is another theme that is found within the vision and goals. Consider a **green transportation hierarchy policy for moving people** to guide transportation system decisions. Green transportation hierarchies that prioritize walking, bicycling and transit provide a framework for decision making to ensure that gaps and deficiencies in the pedestrian and bicycle network are prioritized in order to provide connectivity sooner. The state could set a precedent in this area (the City of Portland draft comprehensive plan proposes a people moving transportation hierarchy, but currently no government in Oregon uses this tool).
7. Consider policies and strategies that **recognize the inter-dependency of the various modal plans of the Oregon Transportation Plan, as well as other statewide plans**, including:
  - Recognizing that fully implementing the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and the Oregon Public Transportation Plan benefits the goals of the Oregon Highway Plan and Oregon Freight Plan – as more trips, especially short trips, are made by walking, bicycling and transit, limited roadway space is freed up and congestion is reduced. Policies and strategies in this area help address goals for economic vitality and sustainability in particular.
  - Identifying pedestrian and bicycle facilities that are off the ODOT managed system, but are of statewide significance or interest.
  - An explicit policy that points to the Transportation Options Plan and recognizes the need to encourage and incentivize the public to take greater advantage of walking and

---

<sup>6</sup> Policy 1A: State Highway Classification System “It is the policy of the State of Oregon to develop and apply the state highway classification system to guide ODOT priorities for system investment and management”.

<sup>7</sup> Regional Transportation Safety Plan, May 2012

[http://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/051112\\_regional\\_trans\\_safety\\_plan.pdf](http://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/051112_regional_trans_safety_plan.pdf)

bicycling as it is made safer and easier – this is a key part of maximizing planned investments. It also plays a big part in achieving goals for equity, as some communities do not see bicycling in particular as an activity they can or want to take part in. Policies and strategies in this area help address goals for equity, health, economic vitality and strategic investment in particular.

- Recognizing the inter-dependent relationship between walking, bicycling and public transit and their respective modal plans. This is especially important since (1) so many local transit routes are located along state owned facilities and (2) the distances involved with statewide travel make combining bicycling and walking with inter-regional transit (e.g. Greyhound/Amtrak) routes important. Policies and strategies in this area help address goals for equity, accessibility, mobility and connectivity in particular.
  - Consider policy recommendations to highlight the economic benefits of active transportation in the Oregon Business Plan and highlighting the strategic relationship between the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and Travel Oregon and other partners to increase bicycle and eco-tourism.
8. Consider policies and strategies for **dedicated funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects and maintenance**. Lack of adequate funding is one of the major barriers to achieving the draft goals related. For example, at current levels of funding, based on historic levels of investment, it will take over 200 years to complete the planned pedestrian, bicycle and trail projects identified in the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan.
9. Consider policies and strategies that **give direction on balancing maintaining and improving existing facilities and building new facilities**. Deficient existing facilities, such as narrow bicycle lanes or sidewalks, can be real barriers to increasing levels of walking and bicycling. The 2014 Regional Active Transportation Plan provided a recommendation to “First fill gaps and then improve deficient facilities. In areas with high levels of walking and bicycling, deficient facilities should be considered gaps and also prioritized. Focus improvements for active transportation on connectivity, arterials, intersections, and crossings of busy streets”.<sup>8</sup> Also, **consider updating strategy A.1.a from the 1995 Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan** (“integrate bicycle and pedestrian facility needs into all planning, design, construction and maintenance activities of ODOT and local governments”) with specific tools to achieve this strategy.
10. Consider policies and strategies that **institutionalize incorporating pedestrian and bicycle elements into transportation projects**, such as complete streets checklists and ‘design for health’ checklists.

Thank you for considering this input. Metro staff look forward to reviewing the policies and strategies as they are developed.

Sincerely,

Lake Strongheart McTighe  
Active Transportation Planner

Cc: Members of the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan update Policy Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee

---

<sup>8</sup> 2014 Regional Active Transportation Plan, p.16 <http://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-active-transportation-plan>