

Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

Policy Advisory Committee Meeting #9 Summary

Monday, May 11, 2015, 3:30–4:30 p.m.

Location: Online via Join.Me

Committee Members Present

Jerry Breazeale, *Rural Oregon representative*
Steve Dickey, *Salem-Keizer Transit District*
Chris DiStefano, *Rapha*
Peter Fernandez, *City of Salem*
Bob Joondeph, *Disability Rights Oregon*
Heidi Guinn, *Upstream Public Health* (alternate
for Noel Mickelberry)

Kari Schlosshauer, *Safe Routes to School
National Partnership* (alternate for Gerik
Kransky)
Jenna Stanke Marmon, *Oregon Bike/Ped
Advisory Committee, Jackson County*
Dan Thorndike, *Medford Fabrication*

Committee Members Absent

Tammy Baney (Chair), *Oregon Transportation
Commission*
Craig Campbell, *AAA Oregon/Idaho*
Mark Labhart, *Tillamook County Commission*

Sid Leiken, *Lane County Commission*
Jerry Norquist, *Cycle Oregon*
Bob Russell, *Oregon Trucking Associations*
Phil Warnock, *Cascades West COG*

ODOT Staff Present

Savannah Crawford, *Principle Planner*
Stephanie Millar, *Senior Planner*
Brooke Jordan, *Senior Planner*
Amanda Pietz, *Transportation Planning Unit
Manager*
Jerri Bohard, *Transportation Development
Division Administrator*
Sheila Lyons, *Bike/Ped Program Manager*
Talia Jacobson, *Active Transportation Policy
Lead*

Consultants Present

Peter Lagerwey, *Consultant Project Manager–
Toole Design Group*
Zan Frackelton, *Toole Design Group*
Jeanne Lawson, *Facilitator–JLA Public
Involvement*
Jamie Harvie, *JLA Public Involvement*

Members of Public Present

Bill Holmstrom, *Department of Land Conservation and Development*

Key Meeting Outcomes

The PAC:

- Received an update on the revised draft Policies and Strategies. These were not discussed; committee members were asked to provide feedback by May 29 and further discussion will be held at the June PAC meeting.
- Reviewed the draft Implementation Chapter. Committee members were asked to provide any feedback by May 20.
- Received an introduction to Plan Performance Measures.

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Jeanne Lawson, JLA Public Involvement, welcomed everyone to the webinar meeting and explained logistics of connecting and participating online. Committee members and project team members introduced themselves.

Amanda Pietz, Transportation Planning Unit Manager, explained the meeting purpose. She noted that this was a shorter, online meeting. The intention was to not go too long between meetings and to give committee members the chance to see plan content as it was being pulled together. She said that this was the first time the committee has seen how a whole chapter of the plan came together and noted that several full chapters would be brought to the June PAC meeting. She said the focus of the meeting would be to review the draft Implementation Chapter and introduce Plan performance measures.

Jeanne reviewed the agenda.

March 18 Meeting Summary

Jeanne asked for any comments on the March 18 meeting summary. There were none.

Policy Development Update

Savannah Crawford, ODOT Project Manager, provided a high-level update on changes to the draft policies and strategies, which were included in the meeting packet. She said they did not intend for the group to discuss these changes at the current meeting, but any feedback received from committee members after the meeting would be discussed at the June PAC meeting. Changes included:

- Fixing tone and clarity, including consistency in terminology such as Active Transportation versus Bicycle and Pedestrian.
- Incorporation of TAC comments discussed at the previous PAC meeting, including updates to equity issues such as low-cost transportation alternatives, access to housing, and access to critical services.
- Combining redundant policies.
- Addition of policies/strategies, including:
 - Design treatments
 - Crash proxy data
 - Motorist education
 - Safety issues for biking or walking around new technologies.
- Clarifying language about ODOT interaction with local agencies, particularly changes to Policy 2.5.

- Language on ADA best practices.
- Language around best practices around new technologies at signalized intersections.
- Language around bicycle and pedestrian flow patterns around schools and businesses.
- Encouragement of dissemination of information about bicycle and pedestrian tourism.

Draft Implementation Chapter

Peter Lagerwey, Consultant Project Manager, reviewed the draft Implementation Chapter. Peter noted that this would be the fifth chapter in the Plan and the project team was also working on Chapter 1 (Introduction), Chapter 2 (Trends, Challenges and Opportunities) and Chapter 3 (Policies and Strategies). He asked committee members to look for anything they saw as missing in the Implementation Chapter and also what they thought of the tone.

Peter said Section 2.1, Aspects of Implementation, are standard items in planning documents. He said the project team had identified six roles that government should play at various levels. He asked the PAC to provide feedback on whether they thought everything had been captured.

Peter said Section 2.2, Roles and Responsibilities, provided detail around state, regional and local roles and implementation avenues. He noted that a big part of this chapter was the balance between meeting the goals of the Plan without being too prescriptive. He said the tone changed throughout the section depending on which entity was being identified. Section 2.2.1 focused on ODOT's role; the language in this section is somewhat more prescriptive than other sections. Section 2.2.2 identified three other state agencies that should play a role in Plan implementation. Peter asked PAC members for feedback on whether the project team had identified the correct agencies. Section 2.2.3 focused on Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), 2.2.4 focused on cities and counties, and 2.2.5 focused on Public Transportation Agencies. Peter said these three sections were less prescriptive, focusing more on opportunities. Section 2.2.6 discussed private entities and non-profit organizations. Peter noted that there is an important role for private entities and non-profit organizations to play in implementation, though this section is the least prescriptive, focusing on support, encouragement and partnerships.

Amanda Pietz noted that the Roles and Responsibilities section was intended to recognize the role of many entities within this statewide Plan and was not meant to be prescriptive for local jurisdictions. The goal was to be as transparent as possible and acknowledge the different roles and responsibilities in making the plan successful. It also illustrated the differences between what is done at state levels, regional levels and local levels.

Peter said that Section 3 dealt with Key Initiatives, which the PAC had discussed at their last meeting, so he did not review it in depth.

Peter reviewed Section 4, Steps to Plan Implementation, which includes four Implementation Considerations: Trends, Data Collection and Performance Measurement, Coordination, and Public Involvement. He said this section also includes Performance Measures, which Savannah would touch on later in the meeting.

Discussion

- One PAC member said he agreed with identifying “public transportation agencies” (plural) in Section 2.2.5 because many transit agencies throughout the state operate under different jurisdictions and even private/non-profit entities.
- Several PAC members concurred that Section 2.2 struck the right tone a good balance between making suggestions without being too prescriptive.

- On Section 2.2.4, one member asked whether gaps or adjacent jurisdictions would be further fleshed out. Savannah Crawford answered that there would be a revised version for the June 9 PAC meeting in which several of the notes currently in the document would be fleshed out.

Amanda Pietz asked PAC members to pay particular attention to Section 4.1 to make sure that the content and tone were appropriate.

Jeanne reminded PAC members that the Key Initiatives were topics that didn't fit neatly within the policies but had surfaced through the process as important issues. She asked PAC members to provide any input on the Key Initiatives. Jerri Bohard noted that in the Oregon Transportation Plan, Key Initiatives were a framework for the main issues to be addressed for the Plan, whereas here the Key Initiatives in this Plan were large issues but did not necessarily incorporate all the issues to be addressed. She noted the project team may need to review the language with this in mind. Amanda Pietz said that the intent was for Key Initiatives to be foundational, things that are necessary for successful implementation of the Plan. She noted that some of them may be broader than ODOT's jurisdiction and prioritization/timing were also important to think about.

Jeanne reminded PAC members that the current meeting was being held because Plan development was moving along quickly and the project team wanted to keep PAC members apprised of latest developments and provide the opportunity for feedback. She invited PAC members to send feedback following the meeting.

Savannah asked for feedback from PAC members on the Implementation chapter by May 20.

Performance Measures

Savannah said the TAC would meet on May 26 to go over the performance measures. She noted that performance measures for a policy plan were at a much higher level than at a project level and were focused on measuring plan success. She said that the current meeting would introduce PAC members to the Performance Measures and that the PAC would consider them in more depth at their June meeting.

Savannah reviewed the performance measure categories, including Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety, Utilization, System Performance, Facility Implementation, and State and Local Recognition. She said these had been identified as possible measures for TAC discussion/consideration and that the project team did not plan on measuring all of them. Ideally, the Plan would include six or fewer performance measures.

Amanda Pietz talked about the preamble to the performance measures. She explained that plan-level performance measures focused on achieving plan success or the plan vision overall, which was why they would be high level and fewer in number. She noted that they would not include outcome-based goals such as health, equity, or economic vitality.

Discussion

- A PAC member asked whether ODOT would be trying to use measures that were in use in other parts of the country or accepted by professional associations. Savannah said that ODOT had engaged Cambridge Systematics to look into this, including reviewing measures that are being used in other places.
 - The PAC member followed-up saying that many highway capacity manuals include measures for bike/ped and asked whether these would be used as a starting point. Savannah said yes, that the consultant would review existing measures and identify those that should be used as starting points. The consultant was researching what performance measures could be worked on immediately based on information ODOT had currently, and which would need to be considered in future efforts. Amanda Pietz said that the consultant was looking both at measures that were

appropriate for the Plan and also whether the required information was already being collected as part of established or well-documented practices.

- The PAC member asked whether the project team planned to adopt baselines and targets for performance measures. Amanda responded that the project team were focusing on the areas they want to measure and on overall trends; they didn't want to set targets before establishing a baseline. Setting targets would be later in the process, perhaps a few years away.
- Another PAC member said that the Utilization performance measure should take into consideration barriers to bicycling and walking and that people may want to bicycle or walk but weren't able to. He said context was important to consider and, for places where barriers existed, latent demand needed to somehow be considered. Amanda said that is a good point that warranted further consideration. She added that ODOT needed to consider unintended consequences for all performance measures.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Wrap up and Next Steps

Savannah said that the next PAC meeting would be held on June 9 at the Chemeketa Center for Business and Industry. Chapters 1, 2 and 5 would be brought to the PAC. Performance measures would be a primary part of the conversation, as well any follow up on PAC member comments from this meeting.

Amanda told the group that ODOT was currently doing a round of outreach to get feedback as early as possible on the draft Plan, including making presentations to Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs) and other groups by invitation.

Savannah reminded PAC members to provide feedback on the Implementation Chapter by May 20 and Policies/Strategies by May 29.

Jeanne thanked everyone for participating and adjourned the meeting.