Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
Policy Advisory Committee Meeting #1 Summary

Tuesday, December 10, 2013 1:00 pm – 4:00 pm
Location: Keizer Civic Center, 930 Chemawa Road NE, Keizer, OR 97307

Committee Members Present
Tammy Baney (Chair), *Oregon Transportation Commission*
Jerry Breazeale*, *City of Irrigon*
Craig Campbell, *AAA Oregon/Idaho*
Steve Dickey, *Salem-Keizer Transit District*
Chris DiStefano, *Rapha*
Peter Fernandez, *City of Salem*
Bob Joondeph*, *Disability Rights Oregon*
Mark Labhart*, *Tillamook County Commission*
Sid Leiken*, *Lane County Commission*
Dennis Mulvihill, *Bicycle Transportation Alliance*
Jerry Norquist, *Cycle Oregon*
Steph Routh, *Hopscotch Town*
Bob Russell, *Oregon Trucking Associations*
Jenna Stanke, *Bike/Ped Advisory Committee – Jackson County*
Dan Thorndike*, *Medford Fabrication*
Phil Warnock*, *Cascades West COG*

Committee Members Absent
Sally Russell, *Bend City Council*

ODOT Staff Present
Jerri Bohard, *Transportation Development Division Administrator*
Margi Bradway, *Sustainability Manager*
McGregor Lynde, *Active Transportation Section Manager*
Sheila Lyons, *Bike/Ped Program Manager*
Stephanie Millar, *Senior Planner*
Amanda Pietz, *Transportation Planning Unit Manager*
Lucia Ramirez, *Principal Planner*

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
Gerik Kransky, *Bicycle Transportation Alliance*
Bill Holmstrom, *Department of Land Conservation and Development*

*Attended by phone

Key Meeting Outcomes

The purpose of this meeting was to initiate activities of the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian (Bike/Ped) Plan Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) and establish the foundation for updating the Plan. The PAC:

- Discussed roles, responsibilities and operating agreements
- Received an orientation on the Plan purpose and planning process
- Began discussions that will lead to a vision for the plan

Follow-up items for discussion:

- Avoided cost through bike/ped activity, in relation to financing
- How health and safety should be discussed in the vision

Meeting Summary

Meeting Overview, Welcome and Introductions

Commissioner Tammy Baney welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained her background and role as chairperson of the PAC. She thanked the committee members for their commitment of time and highlighted her desire to produce a quality product cooperatively with the group. She specifically mentioned public health as an important goal area, among others. Additionally, she emphasized that the Plan is a policy document and needs to be balanced and consider the entire transportation system, noting that it cannot become an advocacy document.

Amanda Pietz, Transportation Planning Unit Manager at ODOT, introduced the consultant team, including Toole Design Group, Cambridge Systematics, Kittelson & Associates, and JLA Public Involvement.

Jeanne Lawson of JLA Public Involvement reviewed the agenda.

Introductory Exercise

Peter Lagerwey of Toole Design Group led the committee members in an introductory exercise. He asked each member to introduce themselves and answer the question, “Two years from now [when the development process is complete], what are the things you would like to see included in the final Plan?” The purpose of the exercise was to brainstorm member interests and to address which things could be considered for the plan and which things could influence subsequent work once the plan is complete.

PAC members thought that a successful plan would:

- Provide ODOT with guidance in differentiating types of streets in relation to bike/ped, including places where main streets are highways
- Help build choice and equity into the State’s transportation network
- Focus on improving health and be in lockstep with best practices
- Normalize bike/ped programs
- Set a high standard for Oregon and its communities
- Provide leadership for local jurisdictions
- Use more inclusive and widely accepted terminology, such as “mobility”

- Be compatible with other plans and avoid creating silos
- Provide clear strategies regarding safety – for all modes
- Build energy and momentum around bike/ped
- Integrate multiple modes
- Promote mobility
- Be approved (by OTC) and be implementable
- Promote safety
- Promote accessibility, particularly at sidewalks and crossings
- Promote connectivity
- Consider facilities at both local and state levels
- Consider demographics and trends
- Demonstrate return on investment
- Consider funding
- Maximize use of existing infrastructure

Peter explained that this list will help inform the visioning work at the next PAC meeting as well as help guide his work in developing the Plan.

PAC Charge and Protocols

Amanda Pietz talked about the purpose of the Plan and role of the PAC.

Jeanne Lawson reviewed the PAC roles and responsibilities. She asked the group to review the draft operating protocols and provide feedback. Particular items of discussion included:

- Decision-making: PAC members agreed to a 2/3 majority in decision-making, though several members indicated they would hope for a higher level of agreement.
- Alternates: There was discussion around the pros and cons of allowing PAC members to designate alternates. Members agreed to allow an alternate to attend, participate in, and vote in PAC meetings, with the expectation that the alternate is named early in the process and kept well briefed. The Chairperson noted that she expects alternates only to be used when necessary.
- PAC members representing the views of constituents: It was noted that members were selected as individuals because of the perspectives they can represent such as a local government (e.g. county), mode (e.g. freight), or goal area (e.g. equity). While members are affiliated with an organization, members vote as individuals rather than on behalf of constituents. Each member is responsible for how to bring together their own perspectives with those of their constituents. The project team expects that members will note if their organization has concerns and raise them early in the process. Organizations always have the option to provide input separately.

Amanda said that Lucia Ramirez, the ODOT project manager, will be the primary conduit for project communications (Lucia's email address is Lucia.L.Ramirez@odot.state.or.us). The project team will provide meeting materials at least a week ahead of time and will post materials to the project website.

Initiating the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

Amanda Pietz set the stage for why the Plan was being updated now, explaining now that there is currently little overall policy framework to help guide decisions and investments and no future statewide vision for walking or biking in Oregon. The current Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, adopted in 1995,

included both policy and design guidance. The design component of the plan was separated and updated in 2011. The current project will overhaul the policy component, which was minor in the 1995 Plan.

Amanda presented the desired outcomes of the plan update. She explained that the Oregon Transportation Plan is supported by mode plans and topic plans, and that mode and topic plans are interconnected. There is a large push at ODOT at the moment to update many of these state-wide policy plans. Updating plans will be an ongoing process due to the number of plans and length of planning cycles. Plan updates are led by ODOT's Planning Unit in collaboration with subject matter experts in ODOT. This helps avoid conflicts between plans.

- One member asked what the Transportation Options Plan is. Staff responded that it focuses on integrating transportation options strategies, programs, and investments into transportation planning. Transportation options enhance traveler opportunities and choices to bike, walk, take transit, share rides, and telecommute.
- One member asked when the ADA plan was last updated. Staff responded that it was updated in 2011.
- There was a discussion about staggering plan updates over time. Plan update schedules are based on capacity as well as funding and legislative requirements. One committee member expressed concern that having plans in various developmental stages undermines the ability to see the whole picture when presenting funding considerations, particularly the argument of avoided cost. ODOT staff said that making a business case for bike/ped is one of the goals of the current process. It was also noted that funding allocation is possible without complete policy documents. The issue of financing and avoided cost was identified as an item for further discussion.

Lucia Ramirez, Principal Planner at ODOT, discussed the requirements of a modal plan and explained that they are high-level policy plans that set a vision, goals and objectives to guide decisions, investments, and implementation activities. She presented the key questions to consider in developing the Plan: defining the statewide vision and policies; determining how to prioritize investments; and defining the roles of state and local jurisdictions. She said there is a need to address and balance bicycle *and* pedestrian requirements, and there may be points where the two topics are addressed separately or together.

- Amanda Pietz pointed out that modal plans set out a *statewide* vision for transportation, not only what ODOT will do – however, she noted that it is still important to consider ODOT's role when developing the plan.
- It was noted that transit and bike/ped are linked but have separate plans and that figuring out how these two connect is important.

Plan Development Work Plan Overview

Peter Lagerwey provided an overview of the Plan elements and discussed the PAC work plan. The PAC will meet approximately 15 times over the next two years. There will be three stages: Data, Research, and Review; Develop Policies and Strategies; and Develop the Plan. There will be opportunities for public and stakeholder input throughout the process. Peter explained that OTC is the final decision-maker for plan adoption and will consider recommendations from the PAC, as well as input from the technical support team and public/stakeholder input.

Peter presented a list of topics that are likely to be included in the plan and those likely not to be included. Policy recommendations; funding needs and considerations; performance measures; a

prioritization framework; and implementation considerations are likely to be included. Design guidance; project recommendations; network planning; network maps; and specifics on education and enforcement are not likely to be included (although policies around education are likely to be included).

- One committee member asked whether the anticipated plan content will be different from the existing bike/ped plan. Staff explained that the new plan will be very different. The existing plan has design guidance in it and only contains one policy, so it is not up to the same standard as other statewide policy plans. It also does not comply with some regulations for state and federal planning.
- A committee member noted that Oregon's demographics vary widely, and asked whether the PAC will consider demographics. Staff noted that demographics will be an essential consideration. Some pre-work for the project has been done to explore these types of issues.

Bicycling and Walking in Oregon Today

Margi Bradway, Sustainability Program Manager at ODOT, presented an overview of the history and current status of bicycling and walking as a mode of transportation in Oregon. Oregon has historically been a leader in promoting bicycling and walking in transportation planning. Oregon was the first state to pass a Bike Bill in 1971. This bill required ODOT, cities, and counties to provide bicycle and pedestrian facilities, as well as providing dedicated funding and creating a bike/ped committee. Since the 1970s, Oregon has also been an early adopter of a range of bike/ped facilities and innovative designs.

Margi said a number of Oregon communities have been designated as bike-friendly. She presented census data regarding biking and walking as a primary mode of transportation to work; many Oregon communities are above the national average. Several Oregon cities are significantly higher than the national average, and many are improving. Though Portland is Oregon's largest city, many smaller towns have very high rates of walking and ridership. There are also some Oregon towns below the national average. The Safe Routes to Schools program has been very successful in Oregon and has led to high rates of riding and walking to school.

- Committee members noted that statistics can be misleading and may not represent factors such as inter-city commuting.
- A committee member noted that Portland's bicycle ridership rates have flattened in recent years and that there should be consideration of theoretical maximums for walking and riding

Margi discussed the economic benefits of biking and walking, including events and the attraction of active transportation related businesses to Oregon.

- One committee member noted that active transportation businesses can win business just by being from Oregon. Oregon has attracted these sorts of businesses, but now other places are competing so there is a need to stay innovative.

Themes from Preliminary Stakeholder and PAC Interviews

Jeanne Lawson reviewed key themes from stakeholder interviews. Jeanne conducted 25 stakeholder interviews earlier in 2013 to inform development of the Request for Proposals for the Plan. Of the interviewees, over half were ODOT staff and the rest were external stakeholders. A summary of stakeholder interviews was included in the meeting packet.

- The group discussed the links between active transportation and health. There have been studies directly linking bicycle riding to savings in healthcare costs. Lack of activity is the biggest

problem to health but not yet sure how to tie that into the Plan. It was suggested that emissions impacts from walking/riding next to roads might be considered in the Plan.
- One committee member noted a connection between safety and health.
- The connections to and from public transit routes were noted as important.
- A committee member said that a lot of older individuals are cycling in the Rogue Valley, noting that demographics will be an important issue to consider.

Lucia Ramirez reviewed key themes raised by PAC members during their interviews, which closely mirrored issues heard during stakeholder interviews.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Wrap up and Next Steps

Jeanne Lawson asked for final thoughts from PAC members –

- One committee member said that education is an important component; people using facilities need to know how to use them and how to respond to other users.
- A couple committee members commented that bicycle and pedestrian issues are important for economic sustainability. They are also important in helping people maintain jobs and access to adequate housing, particularly for vulnerable populations and in communities without many options for public transportation.
- There was a question why the bike/ped plan is being updated separately from the transit plan. Staff noted that the plans are at very different stages and each has a wide and unique variety of needs, issues, and stakeholders that need to be understood and considered. Currently, many plans are older and information contained in them needs to be updated. Thus, doing them separately allows the plans to move forward rather than stagnate. It was decided to keep them separate for this round of updates, though there may be consideration of other approaches in the future.
- It was noted that tying the plan to health is important to the committee.

The next meeting will be February 10 at 1pm at Chemeketa Center for Business and Industry in Salem. It will be a vision development meeting. Prior to the next meeting, PAC members are asked to review notes from this meeting and other materials provided by staff. Chairperson Tammy Baney thanked everyone for coming and adjourned the meeting.