Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
Policy Advisory Committee Meeting #6 Summary

Tuesday, December 16, 2014 1:00 p.m.–4:00 p.m.
Location: Chemeketa Center for Business and Industry, 626 High Street, Room 115, Salem, OR

Committee Members Present
Tammy Baney (Chair), *Oregon Transportation Commission*
Craig Campbell, *AAA Oregon/Idaho*
Noel Mickelberry, *Oregon Walks*
Bob Joondeph, *Disability Rights Oregon*
Gerik Kransky, *Bicycle Transportation Alliance* (alternate for Dennis Mulvihill)
Peter Fernandez, *City of Salem*
Jenna Stanke, *Oregon Bike/Ped Advisory Committee, Jackson County*
Steve Dickey, *Salem-Keizer Transit District*
Jerry Norquist*, *Cycle Oregon*
Phil Warnock, *Cascades West COG*

Committee Members Absent
Jerry Breazeale, *Rural Oregon representative*
Sid Leiken, *Lane County Commission*
Chris DiStefano, *Rapha*
Mark Labhart, *Tillamook County Commission*
Dan Thorndike, *Medford Fabrication*
Bob Russell, *Oregon Trucking Associations*
Sally Russell, *Bend City Council*

ODOT Staff Present
Savannah Crawford, *Principal Planner*
Talia Jacobson, *Transportation Planner*
Stephanie Millar, *Senior Planner*
Amanda Pietz, *Transportation Planning Unit Manager*

Consultants Present
Peter Lagerwey, *Consultant Project Manager–Toole Design Group*
Jeanne Lawson, *Facilitator–JLA Public Involvement*
Sylvia Ciborowski, *JLA Public Involvement*

Members of Public Present
Hersch Sangster, *Keizer Traffic Safety/Bikeways*

*Attended by phone

DRAFT

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Commissioner Tammy Baney, PAC Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting and committee members and audience members introduced themselves.

Review Agenda and 10-28-14 Meeting Summary

Jeanne Lawson explained that the primary purpose of this meeting is to introduce and discuss the first set of sample draft policies and strategies.

The PAC approved the 10-28-14 meeting summary by consensus.

PAC Member Report Outs

PAC members did not provide any report outs.

Plan Framework

Savannah Crawford, ODOT, gave an update on the project schedule and briefly reviewed the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan structure. The project is currently in Phase II, which includes developing policies and strategies.

Discussion on First Set of Sample Policies

Peter Lagerwey directed members to the "Sample Policies and Strategies" document and kicked off a discussion of the sample draft policies and strategies. He noted that the expectation today is for members to provide input and comments on this first set of policies and strategies, and let staff know whether they are on the right path as they continue to develop more.

Peter Lagerway explained that the Technical Advisory Committee provided the following guidance for drafting the policies and strategies:

1. Policies should be *practical*.
2. Policies should *enable* staff to promote better walking and biking in their communities.
3. Policies should be *consistent* and *flexible*. This means that they should demonstrate good judgment, wisdom, and expertise that staff in various jurisdictions can rely on, but at the same time allow for local variations and recognition that biking and walking does not look the same in all parts of the state.

He reminded members that earlier in the committee process, members shaped the Plan vision and nine goal areas. Each of the goal areas will have two to three policies, and each policy will include a number of detailed strategies.

Peter Lagerway asked members to consider the following questions as they discuss the policies and strategies:

1. Does the policy or strategy include the correct information? If yes, is it the right level of detail?
2. Authority: Is the policy or strategy something that the state can, should, or must mandate to local agencies? This will eventually feed into the Plan's identification of roles and responsibilities (Chapter 6).

DRAFT

3. What is the relationship between agencies at various levels (state, local, regional, etc.) in complying with or implementing the policies and strategies?

Overall Discussion of Policies and Strategies Organization and Structure

Members made several comments about the overall organization and structure of the Plan:

Defining "goals," "policies," and "strategies": Members discussed how "policies" and "strategies" should be defined and organized in the Plan. Members generally agreed that clarity is needed on the definition and function of goals, policies and strategies.

- Amanda Pietz noted that the intended structure of the Plan includes "goals" that explain *what* the state seeks to accomplish, followed by high-level "policies" and more specific "strategies" that explain *how* to achieve those goals.
- One member commented that policies and strategies should be supportive of the overarching goal. Goals can be aspirational, but policies should provide guidance on how to meet the goal, and strategies should go deeper and provide more practical, specific guidance.
- Another member felt that strategies should explain how to reach the goal, and policies should provide direction on the goal. Policies should explain what we aim to do, and strategies explain how to do that.

Measurable benchmarks: One member commented that he felt there is a lack of sufficient data to understand the present situation (for example, number of bicycle/pedestrian crashes and their locations). Once we have sufficient data, then Oregon can develop goals and guideposts for how to reach those goals, along with strategies to incentivize those actions. It is important to have measurable benchmarks in the Plan to help assess whether we are meeting goals over time. Staff responded that some data is available, including what was presented in the Existing Conditions report, data from the ODOT Safety Division on factors that lead to bicycle and pedestrian accidents, and anecdotal data on issues and concerns.

Voice: One member felt that the policies, strategies and goal lack a clear voice. The same kind of language should be used throughout all of the goals, policies and strategies. Practitioners and users of the document should not have to dig through to understand the main goals and intent.

Same structure under each goal: Members suggested that the policies and strategies be listed under the same kind of structure in each goal area. They would like to see a consistent, predictable structure for each goal. One suggestion is to organize the policies consistently under the 5 "E's" (where they apply). Peter Lagerwey added that the document could also include matrices that organize the information in different ways.

Discussion on "Safety" Policies and Strategies

Members made the following comments about the ***Safety goal***:

- Tammy Baney suggested changing the goal to: "~~Strive to~~ Eliminate bicycle and pedestrian…" Other members agreed.
- A member noted that the phrase "bike or use walking routes" is cumbersome, but others noted that this is intended to include wheelchair users. One person suggested using the term "walker" with a disclaimer that defines "walker" as anyone who walks, rolls, uses strollers, mobility devices, etc.

Members suggested ***adding*** the following policies or strategies:

- One member suggested adding three strategies:
    - Engage local leaders in developing context-sensitive approaches to reduce crashes.
    - Maintain safe networks on state facilities.
    - Provide tools and expertise to local jurisdictions.
- One member suggested including language that encompasses negative interactions between bicyclists, pedestrians and vehicles that go beyond crashes, injuries and fatalities (i.e., creating "safe and courteous" interactions between modes).
- Members generally agreed that the safety goal should include a policy that addresses vehicle speeds, including how design and separation influence speed and safety. Data on the correlation between speeds and fatalities, and the amount of physical separation recommended for various vehicle speeds should be used to set policy direction.
    - Another member noted that it is unsafe to have co-location in some places. For these places, it would be safer to have some alternative multi-modal facilities nearby.
    - A member said that a speed policy statement should provide exceptions that allow reduced speeds at cross-sections with higher speed limit streets that have high bicycle and pedestrian use.
    - Chair Tammy Baney asked how to implement this kind of strategy state-wide, without making all roads 25 mph.
    - Amanda Pietz suggested including some policy statement that explains that different treatments are needed for roads with higher speeds to make them safe for bicyclists and pedestrians.
    - <u>Outcome</u>: Peter Lagerwey said that staff will draft a speed policy for committee review.
- One member suggested adding language about accessibility and how it relates to safety. This should speak to accessibility of pedestrian facilities, and perhaps reference legal standards that require accessible facilities in new development. Structurally, the Plan could include one section that speaks to accessibility, or accessibility could be mentioned throughout the document as appropriate.

Members made the following ***comments*** about policies and strategies under the Safety goal:

- *Policy 1 - "Encourage, support and implement education policies…"*:
    - One member said that the policy should lead with reducing crashes, injuries and fatalities – that this should be a clear policy in itself. This led to a discussion about the structure of goals, policies and strategies, and whether the goal served as that overall safety *policy* direction.
        - Amanda Pietz noted that for the Safety category, reducing and eliminating crashes is the goal. Policies and strategies explain how to reach that goal, and include education, getting more data, enforcement, etc.
    - One member noted that education is an important component, but not as valuable as many other policies that do more to improve safety. Other members felt that education is a critical component, and should be included throughout the various goal areas.
- *Policy 2 -"Increase the visibility of bicyclists and pedestrians at street crossings"*: One member expressed concern about increasing visibility as a policy, because it seems written from the perspective of a car driver. Bicyclists and pedestrians should not be expected to wear bright colors.
- *Policy 3 – "Minimize perceived or actual safety risk…"*: Members discussed the phrase "level of comfort" in this policy. They recognized that people are more likely to walk and bike when they feel safe and comfortable, but the language as written seems subjective and nebulous. They suggested adding more

DRAFT

parameters to this phrasing. One person suggested using the term "level of traffic stress," and another referenced the target of building cities that are comfortable for everyone from ages eight to eighty.

Discussion on "Accessibility and Connectivity" Policies and Strategies

Peter Lagerwey explained that to date, two draft policies have been developed around this goal which focus on filling gaps in the bicycle and pedestrian network and facilitating connections to other modes. He asked for feedback on these policies.

Members made the following comments:

- General comments:
    - One member noted that it may be useful for this section to distinguish between existing versus new environments. Improving or retrofitting existing infrastructure is costly because past land use and transportation policy was car-centric. New road projects should encourage networks and infrastructure that facilitate biking and walking.
    - One member noted that it is not clear who is being directed and who is responsible in these policies and strategies. The language should be more explicit about who has authority and who is being directed. For example, who "considers locations of transit stops" and who "provides model code."
    - Members suggested providing language that provides context for the goal and policies. One suggestion is to include a transition sentences that ties the policies back to the goal, to personalize it and give it more context. The sentence could explain *why* the goal is important.
- *Policy 1 - "Focus on bicycle and pedestrian networks which fill gaps…"*:
    - *Strategy B:* Improve connectivity of existing system. Encourage projects that improve connectivity of street grids and trails, or address existing barriers such as bridge with poor bike or pedestrian access, cul-de-sac or dead ends to provide better local connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians.
        - One member asked for clarity around Strategy B. Staff responded that it is meant to recognize local issues (like street grids) that as a state we should try to fix. It does not necessarily mean that ODOT will provide funding.
        - One member suggested that this strategy call out freeway barriers that divide neighborhoods. Grade separated facilities may be needed in these areas.
- *Policy 2 - "Facilitate bicycle and pedestrian connections to other modes"*: One member commented that the language should also address other modal access to bike and pedestrian routes—not just bicyclists and pedestrians access to other modes.
    - *Strategy B*: Work with transit providers to understand potential demand for bikes on buses.
        - Members discussed Strategy B. Some noted that it is narrow in scope because it only speaks to bicycles on buses. Another member wondered if this kind of strategy is too specific; the level of detail and specificity should be consistent across all goal areas. Amanda Pietz responded that this strategy acknowledges that the inability to carry a bike on a bus is a barrier to bicycling.
- *Policy 1 and 2:*
    - Members agreed that the language "focus on" in Policy 1 and "facilitate" in Policy 2 is too weak. One member suggested a strong policy with teeth, such as "prioritize or give extra points to

DRAFT

projects that fill identified gaps in established plans." Tammy Baney suggested changing the Policy 2 to: "~~Facilitate~~ Connect bicycle and pedestrian facilities to other modes."

- *Other potential policies/strategies*: Members made the following comments:
    - A *"context sensitive approach"* policy might provide an opportunity to define some standards. (ex: planning standards for urban town centers versus rural areas).
    - *"Recreational connectivity"* and *"regional trails"* policies could explain options for connecting multi-use paths, and could provide information for how to talk about the benefits of recreational trails. These policies should consider bicycle tourism.

Discussion on "Community and Economic Vitality" Policies and Strategies

Members made the following comments:

- One member suggested adding the following policies or strategies:
    - Recognition of Oregon as a rising recreational/tourism destination, and Oregon's scenic bikeway program.
    - Acknowledgement of the cost savings of retrofitting existing infrastructure to encourage biking, walking and busing.
- *Strategy D*: One member asked to clarify whether Strategy D is limited to state office buildings.
- *Other potential policies or strategies*:
    - *Sidewalk infill- developer funding*: One member commented that any policy or strategy on this topic should speak about sidewalk infill generally. One suggestion is to have something similar to wetland mitigation banks that could be used to help fund building sidewalks strategically rather than waiting for development to fill sidewalks gaps. Another member agreed, and was concerned about including system development charges in the Plan since they cannot be used for sidewalks.
    - *Encourage mixed-use to encourage biking and* walking: One member asked to clarify what kind of mixed-use is implied.
    - *Americans with Disabilities Act*: Since the ADA is a law, it does not need to be called out as a policy or strategy.

Public Comment

Mr. Stangster thanked the committee for their work. He said he is very impressed with their discussion and agrees with many of their points. The State cannot simply keep expanding I-5. We need to invest more in trains and bicycles. This committee's work will help local-level advocates convince staff and elected officials about the need for more alternative transportation.

Next Steps

The next committee meeting is scheduled for February 3. At the next meeting, members will review a full set of draft policies. The next meeting may be longer in order to get through the six remaining goal areas. Staff will provide draft materials in advance of the meeting.

A committee member said that it would be helpful l to have feedback from the TAC on the policies and strategies. Staff will look into this, but there is no TAC meeting scheduled for January. The ODOT Plan Coordination Team will provide some feedback on implementation issues and concerns.

DRAFT