

# Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update

---

Highlights of Major Themes

Stakeholder Interviews to Define Project Scope

Prepared for Oregon Department of Transportation  
by JLA Public Involvement

Submitted May 13, 2013



# CONTENTS

---

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>DISCUSSION OF MAJOR THEMES</b>	<b>2</b>
Safety	2
Funding and Investments	2
Vision, Policies and Framework for a Statewide Network	2
Commuting/General Transportation Focus, Recreation Support	3
Integration and Accommodation of Multiple Modes	4
Multimodal Planning	6
Standards, Measures and Data for Setting Priorities and Investing	7
Building Better Communities	9
Governance: Local and State Responsibilities	10
Education and Enforcement	11
<b>Appendix A: Stakeholder Interview List</b>	<b>12</b>
Internal stakeholder interviews	12
External stakeholder interviews	13
<b>Appendix B: Interview Questions</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix C: Additional resources</b>	<b>15</b>

## Introduction

---

ODOT is developing a statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (the Plan), which will replace a plan updated and adopted in 1995. The Plan is under the 2006 Oregon Transportation Plan, which provides the overall policy framework for this modal plan. This modal plan is intended to define more specifically the goals, policies and strategies that will guide the management and development of the state's transportation system to support bicycle and pedestrian travel.

The Plan will be developed through consultation with stakeholders, representing a variety of transportation interests.

As a first step in developing the Plan, ODOT asked Jeanne Lawson of JLA Public Involvement to interview a diverse set of stakeholders from within and outside the agency. A total of 42 individuals were interviewed; together, these represented 15 external agencies and organizations, and 15 programs and groups within ODOT. This document summarizes the results of those interviews.

### *Purpose of the Interviews*

The purpose of these interviews was to seek the advice of a diverse set of transportation stakeholders on what issues the Plan should address, as well as the breadth and depth into which the Plan should discuss the opportunities and challenges associated with those issues.

There were 25 interviews in total, each including one to five interviewees. Interviews were casual and conversational in format, most were done in person; a few were done over the phone or by video conference.

### *Format of this Summary Report*

Given the diversity of responsibilities of the internal set of stakeholders and the depth of involvement in related transportation planning efforts of the set of external stakeholders, there were few issues raised by interviewees in one set that were not also raised by interviewees in the other set. Therefore, the findings of the interviews are summarized in an overall Discussion of the Major Themes. A specific set of questions was used as a foundation for the interviews, but the issues raised did not always fall neatly into one question or another, so the discussion is organized by issue rather than by question.

Attachment A presents the list of interviewees Attachment B presents the questions used as a foundation for the interviews. Attachment C presents a list of resources suggested by the interviewees.

## Discussion of Major Themes

---

Following are the most common issues raised throughout the interviews.

### Safety

For nearly all interviewees, this was a primary issue, especially in regards to the safety of vulnerable road users. While the preferred strategies to address safety problems may have differed, the most common goal behind the strategies and suggestions was safety. ODOT's safety experts stressed that the most fundamental issue is ensuring that the rules of how to use the facility are clear and intuitive; people need understand how to safely use the facility and interact with other users both through the physical design and education provided. Safety is embedded in the discussions of most of the following issues.

### Funding and Investments

Nearly all interviewees, both within and outside of ODOT, emphasized that the major challenge to achieving goals for a better bicycle and pedestrian ("bike/ped") system will be the availability of funding. Many also stated that a primary purpose of this plan should be to provide a basis for more strategic and coordinated investments that makes better use of the limited funding. Perspectives on funding varied and often conflicted, but among the most common were:

- Establish reliable, stable funding.
- Set realistic expectations and goals that recognize the limited funding.
- Identify or develop new, targeted funding source(s). Ideas included:
  - A means for bicyclists to contribute
  - An OTIA-like fund to make major progress on getting a system in place
  - Collaboration or partnering, such as with education to use "yellow school bus" funds to promote walking, or with Nike to promote safe routes to schools with special clothing, or with TMAs to support their goals of reducing employee commutes.
- Funding is imbalanced. Facilities were built without accommodating pedestrians and bikes. Now we need to put more emphasis on building out the system for these modes. Funding doesn't take into account the number of active transportation users.
- Increasing congestion is a big problem. Getting people out of cars is going to be the most cost effective and affordable way to keep people moving.
- Some external stakeholders advocated using more of the state's gas tax funds for these modes based on the previous imbalances and/or benefits to overall mobility.
- Do not invest in new facilities if it has not been identified how they will be maintained (who is responsible and where the funds will come from).

### Vision, Policies and Framework for a Statewide Network

Nearly all the stakeholders within and outside of the agency stressed that the plan should in some way result in the identification of an integrated system for pedestrians and bicycles, and that the system include a connected strategic statewide network of bicycle corridors. Most interviewees

advised that this plan should not only establish policies, but that it should identify needs. Interviewees suggested that based on those needs and policies the plan should establish a framework of priority corridors for active transportation – or routes of statewide significance – and determine the gaps in that framework. The policies of the plan should be used to prioritize future projects that would help implement that framework. It was suggested that as the network is developed, the role of deciding whether a route should be on the road or on a separate path should be determined based on policies of the plan along with the needs and conditions in a particular area. As one region planner summarized, “First identify the network, then the routes, then the projects.” Others discussed defining the system by identifying existing local, regional and state systems and then tying those systems together.

The need for a “vision” was a major concern for many of the stakeholders, including, key ODOT staff, such as division and region managers, who are responsible for helping decision makers select projects that will provide the greatest value to the state and its communities. ODOT engineers who are charged with planning or designing highway facilities discussed the value of having this vision to guide their work. Local government stakeholders were also very interested in having better guidelines for project proposals and local investments that would contribute to a more integrated system.

Others stressed that to identify this network, there must first be a consensus on the purpose and the goals.

The plan should provide policies for how the network is then implemented. Determine how to put our money where it is most important – e.g. start in the center of a community and then go out, or focus on safe routes to schools. The plan should also recognize the need for different types of facilities for different types of users.

More specifically, several stakeholders urged that the network consider how the state-level nests within local networks, and then how local networks connect with regional networks. Also, provide a functional class map; identify for ODOT staff and others what the desired function is for the bicycle/pedestrian facilities.

### **Commuting/General Transportation Focus, Recreation Support**

There were widely differing views from both within and outside the agency on how and/or to what extent the plan should deal with recreation. Most interviewees acknowledged that transportation is the fundamental purpose of the plan and therefore commuting and general transportation should be the primary needs addressed by the plan. However, many internal and external interviewees stressed that the distinction is not easy to make.

These interviewees noted that separate paths, more often than not, began as recreational paths, but because of the convenience, comfort and separation from traffic have attracted and encouraged more bike commuting. The Bear Creek Greenway in southern Oregon, the Riverbank Trail in Eugene, the Philomath/Corvallis path, the Springwater Corridor – these and others began as recreational

trails but connect different urban centers and are now equally or more heavily used for commuting and general transportation. Safe Routes to School specifically uses these routes for safety reasons. Interviewees offered various suggestions on how to distinguish trails that are more purely recreational. These included loop trails that have the same destination and orientation, unpaved trails, or trails that are clearly for the purpose of touring recreation areas or parks and do not connect destinations.

Furthermore, stakeholders from more rural jurisdictions pointed out that although it may not be a general transportation *need*, many low-traffic roads throughout the state, as well as some particularly scenic routes (Highway 101), attract bicycle touring; so regardless of the purpose of the trip, there remains a need to provide safe facilities. A number of stakeholders suggested that if one of these routes were designated as part of a scenic bikeway, that designation could be a factor in elevating a road's priority for receiving funds for improvement.

Other interviewees stated the distinction was false, that bike travel for recreation is still transportation.

Finally, a couple of internal interviewees suggested that commuting is typically short distance and therefore more the responsibility of the MPO or local jurisdiction, whereas recreational trips are longer and cross jurisdictional borders so they are more of a statewide issue.

### **Integration and Accommodation of Multiple Modes**

Most stakeholders noted that our system has always been focused on cars and trucks and that we need to look at an aggregate system. Many stakeholders discussed the challenge of retrofitting and the need to design new systems with all modes in mind: "Why invest in one mode and have to come back later to address another – especially in urban areas where the mode mix will change."

#### *Distinct Pedestrian Needs*

Several stakeholders stressed that this needs to be a *pedestrian* and bike plan. The concern was that Oregon is a very bike-centric state, but that pedestrian needs should be considered first (especially at a state level). With network design, there is a need to put the pedestrians where the destinations are. It is possible to explore moving bikes onto lower traffic, lower speed parallel routes – but not pedestrians. Pedestrians will always want the shortest route.

#### *Separate Mode Facilities*

The focus of bike community advocacy has evolved from working to provide on-street facilities with rights for bicyclist and pedestrians in the 1995 plan, to now promoting separate facilities. The successes of the Springwater Trail (which is now primarily used for commuting and general transportation) and other off-street paths were cited by many bike community advocates as evidence that separate facilities encourage more use because the user feels safer and more comfortable. Freight interests also supported separating pedestrian and bicycle travel from freight as much as possible to support safety. An ODOT manager noted that she regularly commuted by

bike in her former city where separate paths are available, however, in Salem, she gave away her bike because she didn't feel safe.

Other interviewees stated that whether or not separate facilities are appropriate is a design question for each corridor, but it should be driven by the transportation question and guidance from the Plan's policies. Several stakeholders noted that the higher the speeds and the higher the volumes, the greater the need for separate facilities. Also, they noted that while creating low-stress bike/ped routes is important, we need to make sure we don't dismiss needs on high-stress routes.

### *Accommodating Multiple Modes in one Facility*

Discussions of this topic illustrated that while nearly all internal and external stakeholders agree that facilities should be planned and designed with all users in mind, there are differences in opinion about the extent, the role of safety, and how many resources should be devoted to retrofitting. Stakeholders acknowledged that there can be significant challenges in providing facilities that accommodate all modes.

Health and active transportation advocates, as well as staff from several of the ODOT regions, stated that as a society we have created a system that encourages short car trips. With the width and design of our roads, people don't feel safe getting across the street.

Much of the infrastructure in place was never designed to fully address all modes. The Plan will need to provide specific guidance to help make tough decisions about when and how to retrofit, particularly in older urban settings, given limited resources and right of way. Main streets that are state highways are especially challenging and create conflicts between modes. (Hwy 101 was cited numerous times as harrowing with deaths on this route every year.)

Several interviewees (internal and external) noted that even new facilities need better planning for the active transportation users. Plans for new road facilities need to consider how they will connect or place barriers for existing *and planned* active transportation routes. For example, the new bypass in Southern Oregon apparently did not provide adequate connection for the now heavily-used Bear Creek Greenway.

A number of stakeholders stressed that if we as a state want to encourage a modal shift, we need to do more than just meet standards to accommodate the users. For active transportation users, safety and comfort are primary factors in whether or not they will get out of their cars (if they have cars). For pedestrians, this requires sidewalks that provide a comfortable distance from cars and diesel fumes, and that are well lit.

The two multimodal challenges that were most often cited were:

- Highway crossings of five or more lanes. Most internal and external interviewees agreed on the need to continue to look for better solutions. Signals are typically far apart. Islands can create a conflict for freight if not done properly. Pedestrians need to be able to feel safe and

comfortable in crossing. And the safety experts stressed that crossings need to be convenient – located where people want to cross.

- Retrofitting existing highways with bike lanes and/or sidewalks. Internal and external freight interests expressed concern about the safety of reducing lane widths adjacent to bike lanes, especially when the lane is not continuous. Active transportation advocates and community planners discussed the challenge and frustration of meeting community goals along main street highways when standards are rigid.

Additional challenges for accommodating modes included: the challenge for bikes and pedestrians to navigate interchanges; roundabouts on state highways; and how to allow for transit stations safely in the right of way.

Conversely, some stakeholders noted that there could be opportunities in retrofitting. Access management can be an asset for bicyclists and pedestrians. Even “fix it” funding may provide opportunities during maintenance for using a “road diet” (restriping to fewer vehicle lanes) to create less imposing, more active-transportation-friendly facilities.

Several stakeholders stressed the need to focus on specific corridors or a grid for multimodal improvements, allowing some corridors to remain freight-friendly and some to become more active-transportation-friendly.

### *Rail Crossings and Right of Way*

Stakeholders identified the need to more clearly define who has the right of way where rail and other modes come together. Rail crossings are among the most dangerous of multimodal facilities. Railroad owners and operators do not like parallel trails to be close without a barrier. Regarding Rails to Trails, it is important to recognize that the trail can be converted back to rail in the future. Rail owners want to be sure that new multi-use paths do not create friction when the railroad needs to expand. Planning for safer multimodal connections requires early communication.

### *Intermodal Connectivity*

Many of the stakeholders also discussed the importance of providing intermodal connectivity. The primary concern was to provide good connectivity to transit, including safe, comfortable pedestrian facilities to get to transit as well as safe and secure waiting areas. Several stakeholders also mentioned providing bike storage at Park and Rides. In addition, ODOT Rail staff and several external stakeholders mentioned the growing interest in “train-to-bike” tourism, especially coming from Canada, given Oregon’s reputation for being bike-friendly. Therefore, there is economic value in providing facilities that allow for smooth transitions when bike tourists arrive at the train stations.

### **Multimodal Planning**

The Plan needs to be developed in the context of considering all modes of transportation. A number of internal and external stakeholders acknowledged that the approach of modal planning has helped the agency move forward, but suggested that the time has come to do more integrated multimodal

planning rather than planning in “silos.” They believed planners should no longer concentrate on just one or two modes at a time, instead the focus should be on moving *people and freight*, not cars and trucks. They suggested that a continuation of the dialogue between active transportation and freight advocates will help overcome the tendency of pitting modes against each other.

Regardless of the approach, several stakeholders stressed that for the Plan to succeed, the full range of stakeholders need to be involved – advocacy, ODOT’s tech center, freight community, etc.

## **Standards, Measures and Data for Setting Priorities and Investing**

### *Performance Measures and Standards*

A number of interviewees both internal and external expressed a need for performance measures and/or standards and noted that these need to be up there along with highway standards. Specific suggestions included:

- Safety
- A measure that indicates completeness of a route within the network
- A classification system that includes:
  - What the desired functions are for bike/ped facilities
  - Major multi-use paths of statewide significance
  - Recognition of local systems
- Separate standards for rural and urban
- Anticipated future usage. Existing usage cannot be the basis of prioritizing our investments because we have learned that when a good system is provided, it encourages greater use (Hawthorne Bridge, Springwater)
- Measures that indicate speed and volume of traffic in a corridor in order to determine whether buffers or a separate path is needed. Data shows the impact high speeds have on vulnerable users; the plan should provide a policy to address it.
- Establish some kind of Level of Service (LOS). Nothing that requires it, but nothing that prevents it.
- The nature of the expected users – speed and density of pedestrians and bicyclists (and separate these users when possible)
- Standards should be based on intended use, not on the minimum stipulated by regulation

### *Data for Decision Making*

The general lack of good data to support decision making on both policies and projects was a concern raised by many. Several of the active transportation specialists provided links and materials with existing and emerging resources. [See Attachment C]

Data on safety was a primary issue. “Can we get a Safety Priority Index System (SPIS) for pedestrians and bicycles?” Interviewees expressed frustration that the current ways of collecting information and rules for reporting incidents prevent us from understanding where and why there are collisions

related to active transportation unless they involve a vehicle and cause serious injury. Legislation is needed to require all incidents involving a vehicle be reported to the Division of Motor Vehicle Services (DMV). However, we also need information on bike-to-bike and bike-to-pedestrian incidents.

To develop a statewide network, many stakeholders pointed out that the first data needed are:

- What is currently in place
- What are the conditions
- Where are the gaps

Stakeholders stressed that getting data comparable to what ODOT requires for highway planning is not a reasonable expectation. Several of ODOT's internal region stakeholders pointed out that they work with local communities to help them achieve their plans for compact land uses, but the agency's standards often conflict with that goal. Internal and external stakeholders discussed the challenge of looking at history for data because it can "perpetuate bad habits." Decisions will need to be driven by policies, not just data, and the policies that support compact development and active transportation may need to "trump" some of the highway performance standards, thus allowing more congestion and slower traffic. When building active transportation facilities, communities need to be able to go beyond data and consider who they want to attract.

While many stakeholders emphasized that current use should not dictate design, there was a strong interest in gathering better data on current walking and cycling use as a baseline.

To develop the Plan, stakeholders encouraged ODOT to identify best practices – what works to encourage active transportation, improve safety, and encourage economic development.

Once this planning effort gains better understanding of the dilemmas, ODOT can identify partners to gather data. For example, Public Health did a study on bike crashes that did not involve a motor vehicle.

### *Flexibility and Innovation*

Stakeholders discussed two primary ways in which the Plan should set forth policies that directly address the need to be able to be flexible and innovative.

First, internal and external stakeholders stressed the need to be able to flex around ODOT's standards and allow design exceptions when they will improve safety and function for the active transportation system. There was a concern that communities have been told "no" before, so they don't ask for exceptions on a state route.

Secondly, they said the Plan needs to recognize how quickly this area of planning and design is changing. Policies should encourage innovation rather than providing fixed solutions. In project development and design, policies should keep the intent clear but the specifics of the design open; that way, when you get to construction you can use the latest, greatest approach to the problem.

Many stakeholders also suggested that ODOT take a leadership role in constantly gathering information on what has worked – and has not – from local communities, other states as well as countries.

### **Building Better Communities**

There is a need to define how the plan will help the state meet other policy goals (equity, public health, environmental policy, economic vitality, etc.). This will encourage cooperation between groups/agencies as well as support funding.

### ***Equity and Mobility/Accessibility***

Lower income, more disenfranchised communities tend to get the less active-transportation-friendly facilities built in their areas, though they tend to be more active-transportation-dependent. In addition, we need to address the needs of people who cannot drive regardless of income: children, elders and people with disabilities. Many farm workers walk or bike from rural areas to urban areas to get services.

Stakeholder expressed the need to identify and address issues of equity and focus on disparities to vulnerable populations – both when considering where high-impact facilities are placed and where bike/ped infrastructure investments are made.

### ***Health***

Many stakeholders brought up the growing understanding of just how fundamental active transportation is to a range of public health issues (obesity and overall wellness, asthma, etc.). Stakeholders indicated that this planning process should help support the State's health objectives. Health should not only be recognized in the Plan, but should serve as a central goal for how we develop our system, just as economic development and land use are legitimate factors in deciding how and where to invest in transportation. Public health initiatives, projects and research should be incorporated into this planning process.

### ***Environment***

Several stakeholders noted the obvious connection between active transportation and environmental benefits, most specifically the legislature's mandate to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Plan should recognize the value of active transportation for the environment, including air quality issues, as well as outline how investing in active transportation supports other environmental policy goals. The Plan should provide information/education for policy makers so they can clearly link active transportation with environmental benefits and goals.

### ***Economic Vitality***

Stakeholders discussed the link between economic vitality and active transportation in a variety of ways, although most stakeholders who raised the issue suggested that more information is needed. Several stakeholders referred to studies providing a definite link to cycling and economic benefits, both in terms of how cycle touring supports small rural communities and how urban cyclists support

small businesses. Several people also noted that spending money on active transport keeps money in the state. Since Oregon does not refine or produce oil, any money spent on fuel leaves the state.

Identifying and quantifying benefits to the economy would be helpful in deciding on investments.

### **Governance: Local and State Responsibilities**

When questioned about what should be state responsibilities and what should be local, many of the stakeholders suggested determining that in the context of developing the plan. However, in general, stakeholders agreed that while ODOT's primary responsibility is *connecting* cities, the agency cannot relinquish responsibility for the highway *within* the city. Likewise, ODOT has a stake in supporting in some way the bike and pedestrian facilities of statewide significance, even when they leave the state highway system. The local jurisdiction and ODOT will continue to have a joint role.

Additional specific ideas included the following:

- ODOT should work with the stakeholders to establish policies that determine how state funds are spent.
- ODOT should be responsible for maintaining the vision of a network, identifying needs, championing, and when appropriate, implementing the network.
- ODOT could support local communities, especially smaller rural communities, by providing expertise, collecting data, exploring best practices and mentoring.
- ODOT should understand and facilitate safe and intuitive connections between state and local networks.
- Local jurisdictions should be responsible for establishing land uses that support active transportation, including thoughtful placement of "attractors" in the vicinity of major highways.
- Local jurisdictions should be responsible for implementing and maintaining the paths that are not in state highway right of way.

Some local jurisdictions suggested it would be great to have a bike/ped representative at each region to guide ODOT's work and provide local support for communities that do not have the resources internally.

A number of stakeholders commented on the fact that ODOT's original plan was groundbreaking and they encouraged ODOT to take a leadership role both statewide and nationally, to go above and beyond what is needed.

Maintenance of the bike/ped system was the area of responsibility that remained the biggest question. Many stakeholders stressed this must be addressed in the Plan and subsequently in project development.

## **Education and Enforcement**

Many stakeholders listed education as an important aspect of the Plan. This includes education for system users (motorists, freight, rail, cyclists, and pedestrians) as well as education for policy makers and staff. Education is critical for linking with many of the other policy objectives listed in this section.

Stakeholders stressed the need for educating *all* children in active transportation issues from a young age. There is also an ongoing need to educate drivers on bike/ped safety issues and infrastructure. Some stakeholders pointed out that the adults teaching safety in schools do not always know the rules. There were also suggestions that ODOT's safety education for vulnerable road users should use placement methods that are specifically targeted to pedestrians and cyclists, rather than broad media ads, which can appear to blame the victim when the ads follow an incident.

A number of stakeholders also discussed the need for better enforcement, which would require educating officers and courts about the problems, as well as laws such as the Vulnerable Users legislation, which has been adopted but is not well understood or applied.

Other stakeholders indicated that the Plan should include guidance and provide for training for implementation staff. ODOT and other public employees need to understand regulations, guidelines and benefits.

## Appendix A: Stakeholder Interview List

### Internal stakeholder interviews

Interview group	Name	Role
<b>Planning</b>	Jerri Bohard	TDD Administrator
<b>Highway/Tech Services</b>	Cathy Nelson	Manager/Chief Engineer
<b>Safety</b>	Troy Costales	Administrator
	Julie Yip	Coordinator, Safe Routes to School
<b>Rail</b>	Stacy Snider	Operations Section Manager
	Richard Shankle	Crossing Safety Manager
<b>Transit</b>	Dinah Vanderhyde	Senior Policy Analyst
	Sherrin Coleman	Planning Programs Manager
<b>Traffic/Roadway</b>	Bob Pappé	State Roadway/ Traffic Engineer
	Steve Lindland	Roadway Engineering Unit Manager
<b>Freight</b>	Gregg DalPonte	Administrator
<b>TGM</b>	Sue Geniesse	Senior Planner
<b>Region 1</b>	Kirsten Pennington	Planning Manager
	Jessica Horning	Transit and Active Transportation Liaison
	Lidwien Rahman	Principal Planner
<b>Region 2</b>	Sonny Chickering	Region 2 Manager
<b>Region 3</b>	Mike Baker	Planning Manager
<b>Region 4</b>	Bob Bryant	Region 4 Manager
	Jim Bryant	Interim Planning Manager/Principal Planner
<b>Region 5</b>	Monte Grove	Region 5 Manager
	Teresa Penninger	Planning/Program/Business Manager

## External stakeholder interviews

Interview group	Name	Role
<b>Oregon Parks and Recreation</b>	Tim Wood	Director
<b>Oregon Health Authority</b>	Mel Kohn	Deputy Director of Public Health
	Jean O' Conner	Deputy Assistant Director
<b>Bicycle Transportation Alliance</b>	Rob Sadowsky	Executive Director
	Susan Peithman	Statewide Advocate
<b>Oregon Walks (formerly WPC)</b>	Stephanie Routh	Executive Director
<b>Oregon Trucking Association</b>	Bob Russell	Vice President of Government Affairs
	Debra Dunn	President/CEO
<b>Cycle Oregon</b>	Jerry Norquist	CEO (Cycle Oregon)/former OBPAC Chair
<b>Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (OBPAC)</b>	Jerry Zelada	Current Chair
<b>Jackson County/OBPAC</b>	Jenna Stanke	Member (OBPAC)/Special Projects Manager (Jackson County)
<b>Central Oregon Area Commission on Transportation (COACT)</b>	Mike McCabe	COACT chair and Crook County Judge
	Seth Crawford	Crook County Commissioner
	Penny Keller	Crook County Road Master and attends many COACT meetings
	Bill Zelenka	Crook County Planning Director and attends many COACT meetings
<b>Portland area governments (City of Portland, Metro, Multnomah County)</b>	Lake McTighe	Metro Senior Transportation Planner
	Joe Merik	Traffic Engineer at Clackamas County
	Joanna Valencia	Multnomah County Senior Transportation Planner
	Kate McQuillan	Multnomah County Transportation Planner
	Roger Geller	Bicycle Coordinator, City of Portland Bureau of Transportation
<b>Irrigon</b>	Jerry Breazeale	City Manager
<b>Corvallis</b>	Greg Wilson	Bike/Ped Program Coordinator

## Appendix B: Interview Questions

1. Briefly, what has been your **past involvement** on efforts related to Oregon's Bicycle and Pedestrian planning?
2. In your opinion, how much should the Bike-Ped Plan focus on **recreation trails and paths**, and how much on **commuting/general transportation use**? Explain.
3. Please tell us what you think are **important multi-modal considerations** when it comes to cycling and walking? Which items do you think are the most important **state** considerations and which do you think are the most important **local government** considerations?
4. How would the State Bike-Ped Plan **affect the work you do**?
5. Can you suggest about five **primary issues** that the plan should address (e.g. safety, health, the economy, etc.)?
6. In your experience or observations of planning for bikes and peds, is there any policy or approach in particular that you believe **has not worked**? Any **cautions** that you would like to share?
7. When initiating the plan, is there **anything else** we should know about, anything else you would like to add?

## Appendix C: Additional resources

1. San Francisco Bike Strategy, <http://www.sfmta.com/cms/rbikes/documents/1-29-13BikeStrategy.pdf>.
2. Presentation to OTC that included mapping in Eugene showing correlation of sidewalks and obesity, PSU economic data on spending by active transportation people, etc. [https://www.dropbox.com/s/fot00ep8x8x7k55/Z\\_OBPACFinal.ppt](https://www.dropbox.com/s/fot00ep8x8x7k55/Z_OBPACFinal.ppt). And an article identifying priorities: <http://bikeportland.org/2013/01/30/a-letter-from-the-former-chair-of-odots-bike-and-ped-advisory-committee-82437>
3. Health Impact Pyramid, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2836340/>
4. TriMet's Pedestrian Network Analysis released 18 months ago (<http://trimet.org/projects/pedestrian-network.htm>). And Oregon Walks' report: "Getting Around on Foot Action Plan" (<http://oregonwalks.org/advocacy/getting-around-foot>) included in-person surveys, online, 800 responses, primarily in Portland. Someone looked at all TSPs in the metro area.
5. Harvard study showing the link between active transportation and health and the disparity caused by requiring a match for federal funds <http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/htpf/factors/>
6. Several further resources:
  - Executive Summary of the Existing Conditions, Findings and Opportunities Report for the Regional Active Transportation Plan
  - Draft Principles and Criteria for the Regional Active Transportation Network
  - Metro State of Safety Report  
[http://library.oregonmetro.gov/files//state\\_of\\_safety\\_report\\_043012.pdf](http://library.oregonmetro.gov/files//state_of_safety_report_043012.pdf)
  - U.S. DOT Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Regulations and Recommendations
  - Metro Regional Transportation Plan – Planning for Bicycles / Planning for Pedestrians – fact sheets [http://library.oregonmetro.gov/files//planning\\_for\\_pedestrians.pdf](http://library.oregonmetro.gov/files//planning_for_pedestrians.pdf) and [http://library.oregonmetro.gov/files//planning\\_for\\_bicycles.pdf](http://library.oregonmetro.gov/files//planning_for_bicycles.pdf) and [http://library.oregonmetro.gov/files//key\\_focus\\_areas\\_for\\_the\\_next\\_rtp.pdf](http://library.oregonmetro.gov/files//key_focus_areas_for_the_next_rtp.pdf) and [http://library.oregonmetro.gov/files/active\\_trans\\_fact\\_sheet\\_final.pdf](http://library.oregonmetro.gov/files/active_trans_fact_sheet_final.pdf)
  - Fact sheet on the Regional Active Transportation Plan
  - Rails-to-Trails Active Transportation For America document:  
<http://www.railstotrails.org/ourwork/advocacy/activetransportation/makingthecase/index.html>
  - Beyond Urban Centers: rural active transportation document:  
[http://www.railstotrails.org/resources/flipbooks/2012\\_bucreport/buc\\_report.html](http://www.railstotrails.org/resources/flipbooks/2012_bucreport/buc_report.html)