Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
Policy Advisory Committee Meeting #11 Summary

Tuesday, August 25, 2015, 1:00–4:00 p.m.
Location: Chemeketa Center for Business and Industry, 626 High Street, Salem, Room 115

Committee Members Present

Tammy Baney* (Chair), *Oregon Transportation Commission*
Craig Campbell, *AAA Oregon/Idaho*
Steve Dickey, *Salem-Keizer Transit District*
Heidi Guinen, *Upstream Public Health* (alternate for Noel Mickelberry)
Sid Leiken, *Lane County Commission*
Jerry Norquist, *Cycle Oregon*
Gerik Kransky, *Bicycle Transit Authority*
Jenna Stanke Marmon, *Oregon Bike/Ped Advisory Committee, Jackson County*
Dan Thorndike*, *Medford Fabrication*

Committee Members Absent

Jerry Breazeale, *Rural Oregon representative*
Chris DiStefano, *Rapha*
Peter Fernandez, *City of Salem*
Bob Joondeph, *Disability Rights Oregon*
Mark Labhart, *Tillamook County Commission*
Bob Russell, *Oregon Trucking Associations*
Phil Warnock, *Cascades West COG*

ODOT Staff Present

Savannah Crawford, *Principle Planner*
Amanda Pietz, *Transportation Planning Unit Manager*
Jerri Bohard, *Transportation Development Division Administrator*
Brooke Jordan, *Senior Transportation Planner*
Sheila Lyons, *Bike/Ped Program Manager*
Mac Lynde, *Active Transportation Section Manager*
Talia Jacobson, *Active Transportation Policy Lead*
Henry Fibbs, *Active Transportation Intern*

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

Bill Holmstrom, *Department of Land Conservation and Development*
Adam Meyer*, *Oregon Conversation Network*

*Attended by phone

DRAFT

Key Meeting Outcomes

- The PAC discussed and provided feedback on the draft plan, which was presented to the group in full and in layout for the first time.
- The group decided it was necessary to have an additional meeting to discuss outstanding issues prior to sending the plan to the Oregon Transportation Commission to open the public review period.

Meeting Summary

Welcome

Tammy Baney, PAC Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting. She said she's excited for the group to review the plan as a whole for the first time and she feels the draft plan is a good advancement from the 1995 plan. She said the draft plan is a comprehensive set of policies and strategies, and it reaffirms current and best practices and breaks new ground in highlighting key issues. She acknowledged that the draft plan might not go far enough for some and too far for others, which may indicate that it strikes a good balance.

PAC members, project team members and audience members introduced themselves.

Agenda Review

Jeanne Lawson reviewed some of the key protocols that the PAC had agreed to at their initial meetings, including that the group would try to reach consensus, that the group would consider written comments from members who were unable to make the meeting, and that members could send well-briefed alternates in their place. She also noted that the group had agreed to not revisit previous decisions unless deemed necessary by the whole committee, but acknowledged that the purpose of this meeting is to review the plan as a whole and identify areas where more work or discussion may be needed.

July 7 Meeting Summary

There were no comments or questions about the summary.

Project Update and Next Steps

Savannah Crawford explained that ODOT hopes to send the draft plan to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) in October so the public comment period can be opened. The team then plans to come back to the PAC in the new year to review public comments and discuss changes resulting from the public comment period prior to sending the final plan to the OTC for adoption. Amanda Pietz said that ODOT is trying to make bringing the plan back to the PAC following public review into standard practice, both to give PAC members a chance to review the changes and to work through any questions or issues that arise from public comments.

Overview of Chapter Edits

Pete Lagerwey briefly reviewed changes to each chapter in the draft plan. He noted that, in preparation for this meeting, he had reviewed all the notes from the PAC meetings and listening meetings and felt the draft plan did a good job at addressing comments heard throughout Plan development. Highlighted changes are listed below.

Edits to chapter 1 consisted of energizing language and adding more emphasis on demographics and the importance of biking and walking

DRAFT

Edits to Chapter 2 consisted of energizing language, creating a more positive tone, adding language to the challenges section, and adding more information of benefits of biking and walking as modes of travel

Edits to Chapter 3 were illustrated in the draft plan, either with strike through for deleted language or underlined text for added language. Primary changes consisted of providing examples to complement strategies, adding data policies/strategies, and adding equity policy language

New content of Chapter 4 was being presented to the PAC for the first time. A PAC member asked whether there is a planned level of investment related to the plan. Staff replied that funding scenarios are intended to argue for the necessary level of funding – and to show the implications of current or lower funding. The PAC chair noted that a long-term document like the draft plan will not be able to identify a percentage or amount of funding, but is critical to securing future funding.

Chapter 5 changes consisted of clarifying opportunities and challenges to plan implementation, clarifying key initiatives, adding performances measures discussed at the July PAC meeting, and clarifying roles and responsibilities of Plan implementation.

Further Discussion

PAC members identified items for discussion, where the following topics were identified for discussion: authorities/linkages, enforcement, speed, regional trails, data, climate change, commitment to building new safe facilities, equity, and prioritization.

Highlights of the discussion follow:

Authorities/Linkages

Staff explained that the policies/strategies were written holistically to include all jurisdictions. ODOT must follow them and local jurisdictions must be consistent with them. The Transportation Planning Rule stipulates local Transportation System Plans (TSPs) must be consistent with the OTP and modal plans. It was noted that it is up to the local jurisdictions when to update their TSPs, so not all jurisdictions will be consistent immediately and it's more difficult for smaller communities with less capacity to update. Staff also noted that other plans have included very high level policies, but this plan has been made more specific. However, there is limited authority for ODOT to be too prescriptive toward local jurisdictions.

Staff said that the statewide policy foundation is made up of the OTP supported by the modal plans. All modal plans carry the same weight and authority. There is some complexity in the fact that ODOT owns the statewide highway system and is mandated by the plans, so the OHP may be very prescriptive whereas broader plans such as the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan has more jurisdictions to work with. Staff reminded the group that ODOT is working on a project to integrate the plans into one place and allow better cross-referencing.

The group discussed the role of the Key Initiatives versus the Implementation Chapter versus the implementation plans. Staff explained that Chapter 5 is an introduction to the key implementation considerations. The implementation plans will be much more specific, and this is because they will be shorter term documents than the 20-year full plan.

A PAC member suggested that the responsible agencies be listed next to each of the policies/strategies. Staff replied that they have intentionally written the policies/strategies so that they are all applicable to all jurisdictions – except where they specifically stipulate that they are applicable only to ODOT or local jurisdictions. Staff noted that they must be careful about unintended consequences of being too prescriptive; examples included making language time-specific in which case someone could disregard it in the future due to semantics, or making jurisdictions ineligible for funding due to being noncompliant. It was noted that the fact that the policies/strategies

were guidance rather than requirements was very important to local jurisdiction representatives. One PAC member said she thinks the tone should be collaborative and supportive of local jurisdictions. Another PAC member said that vagueness is important to allow each community to develop plans that suit their needs.

Enforcement
Staff explained that enforcement will be more comprehensively covered in the Transportation Safety Action Plan (TSAP) because law enforcement is involved in the development of that plan. The Bicycle and Pedestrian plan addresses the issue of enforcement about the same amount as other statewide plans, which is to acknowledge that it is very important. Amanda noted that ODOT does not have jurisdiction over enforcement agencies and they are not transportation-specific agencies, so it is difficult to write policy that affects them.

Public Comment
No one offered public comment.

Next Steps
Another PAC meeting will be held in September or October to finalize discussion of the remaining issues not touched upon. The intention will be for the PAC to reach consensus to send the draft plan to the OTC for review.

Between meetings, the draft plan will be updated based on the comments heard today and redistributed to PAC members. *Staff will also include a comment log, noting all comments received from the PAC, to help address some of these issues prior to the next meeting.*

Several PAC members thanked the staff for their commitment to considering and incorporating feedback and that the overall plan was a very good reflection of feedback.

Savannah asked PAC members to forward any additional comments to her as soon as possible.

Jeanne encouraged all PAC members present to attend the next meeting so they can follow up on the issues identified.

DRAFT