

Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Policy Advisory Committee Meeting #7 Summary

Tuesday, February 3, 2015 10:00 a.m.–3:00 p.m.

Location: Keizer Civic Center, 930 Chemawa Road NE, Salem

Committee Members Present

Tammy Baney (Chair), *Oregon Transportation Commission*

Jerry Breazeale, *Rural Oregon representative*

Steve Dickey, *Salem-Keizer Transit District*

Chris DiStefano, *Rapha*

Peter Fernandez, *City of Salem*

Noel Mickelberry, *Oregon Walks*

Gerik Kransky, *Bicycle Transportation Alliance*

Mark Labhart, *Tillamook County Commission*

Sid Leiken, *Lane County Commission*

Jerry Norquist, *Cycle Oregon*

Jenna Stanke Marmon, *Oregon Bike/Ped*

Advisory Committee, Jackson County

Dan Thorndike, *Medford Fabrication*

Phil Warnock, *Cascades West COG*

Committee Members Absent

Craig Campbell, *AAA Oregon/Idaho*

Bob Joondeph, *Disability Rights Oregon*

Bob Russell, *Oregon Trucking Associations*

ODOT Staff Present

Savannah Crawford, *Principal Planner*

Stephanie Millar, *Senior Planner*

Amanda Pietz, *Transportation Planning Unit
Manager*

Jerri Bohard, *Transportation Development
Division Administrator*

Sheila Lyons, *Bike/Ped Program Manager*

Mac Lynde, *Active Transportation Section
Manager*

Consultants Present

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

Jeanne Lawson, *Facilitator–JLA Public
Involvement*

Jamie Harvie, *JLA Public Involvement*

Members of Public Present

Jeff Monson, *Commute Oregon*

Lynne Mutrie, *Oregon SRTS*

*Attended by phone

Key Meeting Outcomes

The PAC:

- Reviewed and provided input on the full package of draft policies and strategies.

Following are some of the key outcomes of the discussion:

- PAC members felt there were areas where policies should be collapsed and combined so there are fewer overall.
- PAC members felt that, generally, many policies need stronger, more specific, or more measurable language.
- Equity was identified as a topic needing more discussion.
- It was suggested that Goal 7: Sustainability could be removed and incorporated under other goal areas.
- Data was identified as a topic that applies across topic areas; the project team will work on how to better incorporate data-related policies into the structure.
- Goal 9: Coordination, Cooperation and Collaboration were identified as needing to be more comprehensive and less data-centric.
- PAC members felt that generally the policies and strategies are good and on the right track.

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Jeanne welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that the primary purpose of this meeting was for the group to review the full package of the policies and strategies. She noted that much of the meeting would be occupied by small group discussions. Each group would consider three of the policy goal areas. She asked PAC members to split evenly between groups based on their interest, number of members in each group, and being mindful to split like-minded members between groups.

Tammy Baney, PAC Chair, thanked everyone for attending the meeting. She asked members to provide a candid, high-level critique of the policies and strategies being presented and to identify anything that maybe be missing. She noted that the committee will have another chance to look at these policies, so the focus today should not be on wordsmithing, but on the bigger picture.

Review Agenda and Approval of 12-16-14 Meeting Summary

Jeanne Lawson reviewed the agenda. She explained the primary purpose of this meeting was for the group to review the full package of the policies and strategies and have the opportunity to provide input on what items were close to ready, what may need additional work from the consultant team, and what needs more major discussion.

PAC members did not have any comments on the 12-16-14 meeting summary.

PAC Member Report Outs

- One PAC member had met with planners and colleagues. He heard that people would like to know about timelines for completion, accountability within the policies, and how success will be defined. He had passed feedback along to Savannah Crawford.
 - Amanda Pietz noted that thoughts on performance measures can be added to the parking lot for consideration in the upcoming planning stages.
- One PAC member had presented information to the most recent Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (OBPAC) meeting and brought back comments on specific policies.

Introduction to Policy Development

Savannah Crawford explained the work that has been done since the last meeting. At the last PAC meeting, the project team heard that PAC members would like to review the full spectrum of policies all at once. In response, the project team has brought a draft of all policies to this meeting and extended the meeting time to allow time to discuss them. The project team has run the policies past several practitioners to ensure that implementation is realistic. Another meeting is planned with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to discuss specific items of interest referred by the PAC during this meeting.

Savannah said that preliminary feedback from some TAC members on the policies and strategies is that “what” and “who” still needed to be defined within some policies. She noted that PAC members may still see some places where specifics on how the policy will be implemented have not been defined. This will be dealt with further along in implementation.

Policy Development Exercise 1: Individual Comments

Pete Lagerwey reminded the group of their process to date. The group established a vision and a set of nine goal areas, and is now at the next step of looking at policies and strategies under the goal areas. He said there are currently 27 policies, which is a little higher than what they were aiming for but they wanted to make sure not to leave anything out. The number of policies may reduce as they are further refined and consolidated.

Pete said that most policies start with an action verb followed by “where” the policy relates to. This is in response to PAC feedback from the last meeting.

Pete introduced the first policy development exercise. Each PAC member had copies of the full set of policies and strategies. The initial exercise was the opportunity for individual PAC members to provide comments on goal areas that would not be the focus of their group. He noted that members only needed to comment on goal areas not covered in their own group. Jeanne said that the notes by individual PAC members would be considered by the small groups as they have their discussion.

- One committee member asked whether the PAC’s feedback from the last meeting was reflected in these policies. Savannah Crawford confirmed that the feedback had been considered. Amanda Pietz noted that, if any changes have not gone in the direction intended, to please offer that feedback. Pete noted that feedback from all the PAC meetings has been incorporated into these policies.

PAC members completed the exercise by writing comments on sticky notes and attaching them to boards containing the policies and strategies.

Policy Development Exercise 2: Small Group Discussion

Jeanne explained the second part of the policy development exercises. The sticky note comments from the first exercise were provided to the groups' for consideration. Jeanne asked the small groups to review the sticky note comments and then decide how to discuss the policies and strategies in order to consider everything within the time allotted.

Jeanne asked the small groups to identify which policies and strategies were good to go, provide any recommendations the groups have for changes, identify any issues that needed discussion with the full committee, and identify anything that needed further consideration by the consultant team before it moved forward.

Each of the three small groups were facilitated by a member of the project team, with other project team members floating to answer questions. Conversations were captured on flip charts by the facilitators.

Group 1

- Steve Dickey
- Gerik Kransky
- Jerry Norquist
- Phil Warnock

Group 2

- Jerry Breazeale
- Peter Fernandez
- Jenna Stanke Marmon
- Dan Thorndike

Group 3

- Tammy Baney
- Chris DiStefano
- Mark Labhart
- Sid Leiken
- Noel Mickelberry

Big themes from small group discussion

During the lunch break, the small groups reported out on some of the major themes of their discussions:

- There are areas where policies should be collapsed and combined so there are fewer overall.
- Wording is often too weak; need stronger action verbs; need to be more specific and measureable.
- Explore different ways to measure completeness of the system.
- Consider whether data-related policies could be brought together under one goal area or section of the plan rather than spread across goal areas.
- Consider places where policies overlap between goal areas and how to consolidate.

Policy Development Exercises 3: Report Out

For the third part of the policy development exercise, the group facilitator or a member of each group reported out to the larger committee. Information from these report-outs, as well as committee discussion during this time, is captured below.

Goal 1: Safety

Feedback from Group 1

- Overall:
 - Education is fundamental to changing our mindset around biking and walking.
 - Licenses should not just be about driving, but more comprehensive – about mobility and rules of the road (e.g. a “mobility license”).
 - Need to cross-reference with the Transportation Safety Action Plan and the other policy-level plans. An electronic format makes this much easier to do.
 - Review policies to ensure that they make specific steps of achieving the goal of zero fatalities.
- Policy 1.1
 - This set of policies and strategies is good.
- Strategy 1.1F
 - *A committee member asked to discuss this strategy with the whole committee, with a focus on speed.*
- Policy 1.2
 - This policy should include the idea of comprehensive mobility education.
 - *This topic was identified as needing discussion with the whole committee.*
- Strategy 1.2C
 - This strategy overlaps with strategies 2.2A and 3.2C. The main goal of these strategies is to identify what data is needed, how to get it, and to define success and benchmarks.
 - Rather than identifying individual modes, be inclusive of all modes of active transportation. This idea can be carried throughout the plan.
- Policy 1.3
 - This policy should not only include schools but also recreation centers and other types of education centers.
 - Some guidance needs to be included around development code and the type of investments that are necessary.
- Strategy 1.3A
 - “Take advantage of” implies that funds already exist. Recommend rewording to include the term “leverage federal funds.”
 - The committee discussed rules around the Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS) program. One committee member said the program no longer has dedicated federal funding, which means the program is broadening to meet local needs. Another member said that his experience was that the SRTS program had to work with school districts, while it was city government that was more interested.
- 1.4
 - Need data that is not just focused on crashes, but also near near-misses, etc. Also consider how people choose routes based on how safe they feel.
- 1.5
 - Strengthen the language of this policy; “encourage” is too weak. Changing the language so the focus is on improving safety and security rather than more users.
 - Include enforcement under this policy, e.g. enforcement of code.

- Amanda Pietz suggested including language that recognizes enforcement as important without providing a mandate to local government or other agencies.
- The larger committee discussed this idea. One committee member noted that, if people don't feel comfortable, the facilities will not be used. Another committee member said that the enforcement piece needs money to go along with it. Another committee member agreed, saying that some enforcement agencies are not even aware of some active transportation policies because the policies did not have funding allocated to make them successful.

Goal 2: Accessibility and Connectivity

Feedback from Group 2

- Overall
 - Policies need to be more measureable.
- Policy 2.1
 - Add a strategy to identify a targeted guidance.
- Strategy 2.2A
 - For a local level strategy, add language that facilitates incorporation of bicycle and pedestrian systems and gap identification into Transportation System Plans (TSPs).
 - For a state level strategy, provide a mechanism to report percentage of system complete and/or explore other ways to measure system completeness. This should include other ways of looking at the level of completeness of routes and areas around key destinations, and recommend developing a way to measure it.
 - One small group member noted that they do not want to mandate local governments but think it is appropriate to require some level of reporting since a lot of information comes only through the local government level.
- Policy 2.3
 - "Ease" is too soft; suggest "improve."
 - Prioritization is stated in the policy but not represented in the strategies. Add a strategy for prioritization of multi modal connections within funding and prioritization processes.
- Strategy 2.3E
 - This strategy should more strongly highlight the importance of connections to transit.
- Policy 2.4
 - Concern around labeling trails as recreational versus for transportation. Uses can change and these labels can affect funding.
 - *This topic was flagged as a larger topic that needs larger discussion.*
- Policy 2.5
 - Add something about consideration of connections to trails (last mile).

Goal 3: Mobility and Efficiency

Feedback from Group 2

- Overall

- One committee member said that it is sometimes unclear to local jurisdictions what the implications are of having an identified national highway system route. Is it the same or different than having a designated freight route?
- Strategy 3.1A
 - This strategy should address jurisdictional authority and responsibility; for example, sidewalk maintenance. If it is on a state route – why is the city sometimes responsible for maintenance?
 - One committee member said this is a challenge due to local government codes.
 - Savannah Crawford explained this strategy originated from wanting to address ADA issues without specifically including them in a policy. She said the project team would clarify this.
 - Another committee member said that this plan will have ramifications for local government and these issues need to be considered when discussing maintenance of the system.
- Strategy 3.2C
 - This needs to be clarified because it seems redundant with strategy 2.2 A, consider greater focus on goal and evaluate policy. A systematic network analysis would be great, let's do it right!
 - Collaboration is needed as well as coordination
- Policy 3.3
 - This policy should be strengthened to put more emphasis on the importance of considering freight routes and bike routes and how they overlap. It should be looked at from both directions – if it is already a designated bike route, a freight route should not be overlaid if there are alternatives, and vice-a-versa.

Goal 4: Community and Economic Vitality

Feedback from Group 3

- Goal language:
 - Change “Enhanced high quality biking and walking systems will ...” to “Enhanced high quality biking and walking system are proven to...” (stronger language)
- Strategies 4.1B and 4.1C:
 - Add the idea of “coordination” and combine these two strategies.
- 4.1D:
 - The small group agreed with a sticky note comment suggesting rewording to “state” buildings, and added to specify “local” as well..
- 4.1F:
 - Rework the language of this strategy. The current wording makes it seem like the intent is to attract a diverse workforce, whereas the focus should be access for the full workforce.
 - Also remove the last section (unnecessary): Promote biking and walking infrastructure on existing facilities to employment centers and commercial districts/main streets to attract a diverse workforce, ~~by providing examples of land use strategies from other Oregon communities.~~
- Policy 4.2:
 - This policy crosses over with Policy 2.5 to some extent.

- There is a need to clarify what is meant by “pedestrian tourism.” While bicycle tourism is a more widely used term, it is not clear what pedestrian tourism means. Seems the intent is people being able to visit Oregon without a car and having the option to walk to their destinations.
 - Amanda Pietz explained this strategy has to do with walking tour maps and other tourism-related resources.
 - A PAC member responded that pedestrian-related items should be called out separately rather than appearing to be added to bicycle tourism. For example, “Developing walking opportunities and providing tools to support this.”
- One written member comment suggested adding two more policies:
 - Develop joint approach to promoting bicycle tourism with Travel Oregon.
 - Use origin and destination data to drive up investment in new bike/ped facilities for short trips and improve access to transit trips.
- The small group recommended adding collaboration with tourism organizations, more generally (not just Travel Oregon).
- One PAC member asked for specific examples of how this policy would be achieved and whether the state would be providing resources such as maps, websites, etc. He said that it is important to support and provide resources to local government.
- Strategies 4.2B and 4.2C:
 - Combine C with B as an example rather than a separate strategy.

Goal 5: Equity

Feedback from Group 3

- Overall
 - Make it clear that bicycles can be a tool to help address equity issues; they are not a means of solving larger equity issues (outside the scope of this plan).
 - One committee member suggested Policy Link as a resource to compare with other policies around the country.
- Goal language
 - Revisit language in regards to the group of people that is called out. The current language might be too limiting (e.g. what about ethnicity?). “Oregonians” was another suggestion as well as “communities that are underrepresented and underserved”.
 - *Equity discussion was flagged as needing further full-group discussion.*
- Policy 5.1
 - Change wording from “environmental justice populations” to “address environmental justice by ...”
 - The intent of this policy is unclear, particularly the word “accepted” – be more specific about the intent.
- 5.1A
 - Revisit language to strengthen it. Suggest changing “consider” to “prioritize.”
- 5.1B
 - Revisit language to strengthen it. “Encourage” too weak.

Goal 6: Health

Feedback from Group 1

- Goal language
 - The goal statement should be stronger and more measurable. Suggest rewording to “Improve public health outcomes by...”
 - Amanda Pietz said that this will need to be balanced against those who see are sensitive to seeing this as social engineering.
 - One committee member noted that having a goal based on health may be a stretch in itself.
 - Jerri Bohard said that ODOT also needs to consider what they can measure versus what the Oregon Health Authority (OHA) measures.
 - Suggested restructuring this goal based on commonly used themes in the health sector: physical activity, air quality, and traffic safety. Traffic safety could relate back to Goal 1.
 - Need to work in conjunction with public health agencies.
- Policy 6.1
 - Rewording this policy so success can be defined and measured. Suggest “Define public health goals to...”
 - Suggest using established standards to measure success, such as Health Impact Assessments (HIAs) or the Integrated Transportation Health Impact Model (ITHIM).
- Strategy 6.1B
 - Make this strategy stronger: reword to “Engage health professionals in transportation...” or “Ensure that health professionals are engaged...”
 - One committee member supported this, saying that it is important to incorporate health professionals into transportation planning.

Goal 7: Sustainability

Feedback from Group 2

- Overall
 - Sustainability should permeate the entire plan and not be its own policy goal area. Policies could be incorporated under other goal areas.
- Policy 7.1
 - This policy could be incorporated under the Health goal.
 - Add a strategy about restricting allocation of Congestion, Mitigation, and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds to go towards bike/ped projects.
- Policy 7.2
 - This policy could be incorporated into the Strategic Investment section, focusing on sustainable investment, i.e. getting the most out of the system we have by investing in the system that is the most efficient.
- *Removing the Sustainability goal area was flagged as needing more discussion with the whole committee.*

Goal 8: Strategic Investment

Feedback from Group 3

- Overall

- Staff had explained the intention of this policy to the small group, which was then reiterated for the whole committee: 8.1 relates to where funding comes from, 8.2 relates to prioritizing funding, 8.3 relates to the state role in filling gaps and connect modes, and 8.4 relates to capitalizing on funding.
- One member said that the goal includes “reduce the need for expanding motor vehicle capacity and reduce system costs” but this is not supported in the policies. An additional policy should be added.
- One member said it is unclear how this goal fits with the Transportation Options (TO) plan and asked how the two overlap and fit together.
 - Amanda Pietz answered that staff will look into how the two plans can cross-link without being repetitive.
- One member asked for the goal itself to be revisited to make the statement stronger.
- Strategy 8.1B:
 - The focus should be on “new, dedicated” funding sources.
 - However, flexibility also needs to be retained, in order to maintain balance.
 - *The role of flexibility versus dedicated funding sources was identified as needing whole-committee discussion.*
- Policy 8.2:
 - The small group agreed with a sticky note comment which recommended adding a new strategy that focuses on supporting the effort to “re-purpose” existing right-of-way (such as rail, irrigation, etc.) to bicycle/ped facilities.
- Strategy 8.2A:
 - Support the priority list under Strategy 8.2A, recognizing they are not in order of priority.
 - Safety should be added to the priority regarding “protect the existing system.”
 - Some discussion occurred as to how the list relates to the “fit-it” and “Enhance” STIP categories
 - *Reviewing the priority list was identified as needing full committee discussion.*
- Policy 8.4:
 - Add clarifying wording such as “capitalize”, “leverage”, or “blending.”
- Strategy 8.4C:
 - The language in this strategy should be strengthened.

Goal 9: Coordination, Cooperation and Collaboration

Feedback from Group 1

- Overall
 - This goal appears to be a collector for stray policies that do not fit elsewhere. There needs to be more consideration of the full range of policies that should come under Coordination, Cooperation and Collaboration.
 - *This was identified as needing whole committee discussion.*
 - This goal is dominated by data-focused policies.
 - *The appropriate way to incorporate data-related policies was flagged as needing whole committee discussion.*
 - *Staff will make a recommendation for a different way to discuss data issues within the Plan*

- Goal language
 - The goal language is missing “who” and “how.” Suggest stronger language to help foster collaboration.
- Policy 9.1
 - Change “enhance” to “establish.”
 - Add a new strategy focused on modelling.
- Strategies 9.1c and 9.1e
 - Neither of these policies in data-related – perhaps another policy is needed to capture them.

Policy Development Exercise 4: Further Committee Discussion of Select Issues

Project staff and committee members selected a few policies to discuss in more detail with the full group, acknowledging that there was not enough time to discuss all of those identified as needing follow-up.

Policy 2.4

Amanda Pietz explained where this policy originated. It is not intended to be exclusionary but rather to point out which trails may be higher priority. She asked the group whether they think it is appropriate between types of trails.

Discussion

- One committee member suggested that trails should be classified similarly to roadways, which would mean more levels of classifications for trail facilities.
- One committee member said they like the clarity of Policy 2.4 and would like to see this clarity emulated in other places in the document.
- Another committee member said that people will go out of their way to use trails that separate themselves from cars.
- The group discussed how Oregon Parks and Recreation (OPR) deals with trails and how this influences the bike/ped plan. Amanda Pietz said that OPR are currently developing their own plan which deals with trails and the project team are coordinating with this effort. One committee member said that, from a local perspective, it can be difficult to work with ODOT and OPR on trails when there is not enough collaboration. Staff responded that they are working with OPR to collaborate and will report back to the PAC on this process.
- One committee member said the terminology needs to be clarified between Policies 2.4 and 2.5 (why does one include regional trails and a footnote definition).

Policies related to data

Pete Lagerwey explained that, structurally, it would be possible to mix data policies throughout the plan; to consolidate it into Goal 9 or its own goal; or to pull it out as something separate from the goals that should inform the whole plan. He asked the committee for feedback.

Discussion

- One committee member said it makes sense to call it out separately. He suggested thinking about how data currently informs the Oregon Highway Plan and identifying what additional information is needed for the bike/ped plan and how to achieve this. Another committee member supported this.
- One committee member said that ODOT could serve as both the driving force to collect data and also as the repository for data collector from different places.

- The project team said they would come back to the PAC with their suggested approach.

Policy 8.2

The group discussed the category list under Policy 8.2 and how it could be reworked to better communicate the intent to prioritize investments.

- One committee member noted that this format is in lockstep with the format that ODOT currently uses to prioritize projects.
- The project team discussed the intent of the policies. The team pointed out that Policy 8.3 is more prescriptive because it relates to state funding. 8.2 is more directed to local funding. 8.4 is there to take advantage of funding opportunities.
- The group discussed the need to prioritize high-need areas rather than making maintenance of the current system the highest priority.
 - Policy 8.1 was discussed, which is intended to address high-need areas.
 - The group suggested that 8.1 should focus more specifically on high-need areas and that the connection between 8.1 and 8.2 needs to be made more clear.
 - The group discussed the importance of the perception of these policies, which can be addressed with the new language.
- The group discussed the need for a separate strategy about prioritizing maintenance and preservation.
 - A couple of committee members expressed support for this. It was noted that we do not currently have complete systems, so they maintenance does not apply to some places and it makes sense to call it out separately.
 - One member suggested that the “add critical connections and address safety issues” should come first to address this deficiency.
 - The group discussed how the items under Policy 8.2 relate to fixing existing infrastructure (item 1) versus building new infrastructure (items 2-4).
 - One committee member emphasized the importance of being “strategic” and would like this term added.
 - One committee member suggested including promotion of good design within this section. The project team said this is addressed in safety but could also be added here.
 - One committee member suggested that the approach needs to be different than the definitions of Enhance versus Fix It because there are so many systems that are incomplete. He suggested that addressing gaps in the system should actually be considered “fixing” a system that is incomplete.
 - One committee member supported this, saying that if something does not exist, it is not safe and cannot be improved. She said that most high need areas are places where things do not yet exist.
 - The group discussed the need to identify these high need areas and the importance of data to support this.

Meeting Closing and Next Steps

Savannah Crawford said that the next PAC meeting will be March 18. The project team plans to bring a revised set of policies and strategies to PAC and begin the implementation conversations. Between now and then, the project team will take outstanding issues from today and discuss them with TAC and Plan Coordination Team.

- Several PAC members noted they will not be able to attend on March 18. The project team said they would contact members regarding availability, but the date is likely to stay the same unless a significant number of members are unable to attend.

Tammy Baney thanked the group for committing to the longer meeting and said they had made it through a lot of content. She looks forward to reviewing the content again at the next meeting to see how they are all feeling about it.

The meeting was adjourned.

DRAFT