



**METRO**

MEETING SUMMARY OF THE BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE FOR TRAILS MEETING 4  
Monday, August 4, 2008, 4:00-6:00 p.m  
Metro Council Chamber/Annex

Members Present: Eileen Brady, Scott Bricker, Rex Burkholder, Chris Enlow, Steve Faulstick, Jay Graves, Cynthia Haruyama, Al Jubitz, Julie A. Keil, Richard Kidd, Randy Leonard, Nichole Maher, Rod Monroe, Rick Potestio, Dick Schouten Dave Underriner, Phil Wu Dave Yaden, Ian Yolles

Members Absent: Dave Underriner, Julie A. Keil, Rod Monroe, Randy Leonard, Rick Potestio and Cynthia Haruyama

Chair Dave Yaden convened the Blue Ribbon Committee for Trails at 4:05 p.m.

1. Committee communications for non-agenda items

Councilor Rex Burkholder reminded the committee that Bridge Pedal would take place on August 10<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Dick Schouten discussed the success of this year's Policy Makers Ride in Washington County. Highlights included the Tualatin Hills Nature Park and the Tualatin River over crossing. Problems included the Hall Boulevard Crossing. The route used the Fanno Creek Greenway South and bike lanes on Hall and Olsen.

Councilor Burkholder informed the committee that himself, David Bragdon, Mike Wetter and Dave Yaden meet with representatives from the governor's staff who are charged with both creating a financing package for next term and looking at the long term future of transportation included providing some direction to ODOT. They discussed the work of the Blue Ribbon Committee and parallel work being done by many communities around the state and informed the group that there needs to be a place at the table from the state on urban trails both in terms of policy support and financing. They told the representatives that they would return with numbers both from the committees' work and other communities' work showing that trails are of statewide interest.

Dave Yaden added that he was surprised and encouraged by the interest the governor's staff expressed on behalf themselves and the governor.

Commissioner Dick Schouten asked for more detail

Councilor Burkholder further explained that the governor had set up three committees to look at transportation, "Vision" to look at financing, one to look at governance and the last to look at communicating to the public about the needs for investment of transportation. The Vision Committee has broken down into three subcommittees, environmental, multi modal, and a larger group to look at the finance piece. He added that there is the idea that the state should do more than roads including make larger commitment to transit and promoting the issue of non-road travel. There was a suggestion to add dollars to the Connect Oregon program and have a competitive urban trail component. It goes to the Governor in September and he will turn it into a proposal for the legislature.

Al Jubitz asked for more clarification on Connect Oregon and competitive urban trails.

Councilor Burkholder informed the committee that Connect Oregon passed twice is 100 million dollars in lottery dollars for non-road uses for transportation. The idea is to take the same model and expanding it to have urban trails qualify and have a set of criteria that jurisdictions could compete for. This is one of the concepts that had interest from the governors staff group.

Chair Yaden made note to the audience to make use of the comment cards since time has not been allowing an audience comment period

2. Approval of meeting summary questions and comments about homework and the agenda

Chair Yaden asked the committee for any questions or comments on the meeting summary or the homework

Meeting minutes were approved

3. Discussion: have we made the case?

Chair Yaden presented a PowerPoint (attached) detailing the desired meeting outcomes for meeting 4 including refining the case statement, determining if the case is made, speak more specifically about governor's transportation initiative, and to begin to identify elements of a strategy going forward.

Chair Yaden invited the committee to participate in open discussion regarding the confidence level in the case statement and point and counterpoint argument from the homework.

Al Jubitz commented that he was happy to see the staff referencing the low-income neighborhoods in relation to the planned trails.

Jubitz added that he was concerned with the consistency in terminology and definitions being used with the committee's efforts and the other statewide and national efforts. He was concerned that from a marketing aspect terms should be intuitive

Metro Staff member Mike Wetter replied that staff would research the issue as well as to research how different terminology polls with the public

Scott Bricker asked for clarification of definitions and terminology

Jubitz gave the examples of terms such as urban trails, bikeways, bike boulevards, non-motorized and segues. He added that even the term "trails" could be defined differently in different contexts (to a backpacker trails could be a narrow dirt trails only access able to hikers). He felt that as the committee determined priorities for the case statement such as transportation the terminology needed to be carefully examined

Eileen Brady clarified that Jubitz was feeling the term "Trails" implied recreation

Jubitz said to him it did

Chair Yaden informed the committee that committee member Rick Potestio (not present) had raised the same issue as well as number of other people. He added that it was a branding exercise and merited more research on the part of staff.

Ian Yolles commented that he was concerned that the case hadn't adequately addressed the assumption "if we build it they will come". He felt there would be a need for a fairly substantial cultural shift with the community and that the case statement need to adequately address community outreach to educate and encourage people and make the world of cycling and walking more accessible as part of people's mental model of their lives

Yolles also stated he felt the argument should be the bold and built on prior successes in the region. Portland already has a high percentage of bike commuting which could be referenced in the case. He added that separating the transportation and recreation arguments was missing the point, the issues being faced are interlocked and the case is more compelling when they are address as a whole.

Yolles informed the committee that Cycling England, a national body that coordinates the development of cycling across England has been extremely explicit in articulating hard specific goals (ex: National Cycling increased 20% by 2012). He felt that data driven and measurable or quantifiable goals could be helpful if added to the case statement.

Jay Graves agreed that the committee could benefit from a short presentation from Roger Gellar of the City of Portland detailing the success the City of Portland has seen with the “if you build it they will come” philosophy including a 64 % increase in bike commuting in the last 3 years and expected additional 20 % this year coinciding with their current build out

Yolles added that existence was the ultimate proof of what’s ultimately possible–it was hard to argue with that

Dave Yaden asked the committee for a show of hands of those members that felt the committee could benefit from a little more about the “If you build it they will come” concept. The committee was divided but Chair Yaden asked for some information additional data to be provided.

Dr. Phil Wu commented that within the public health arena there is a large amount of evidence showing that when infrastructure that makes it possible for people to walk and bike is created they would do it. He added that this is a fundamental principal that is focused on in the preventative medicine community and that group called the Community Guide to Preventative Service has a website that provides national data supporting this that could be cited in the case statement.

Dr Wu stated that he found that the draft statement hit on the key points but tht the health the medical community is trying to deemphasize the issue obesity and frame benefits in terms of overall health. He felt that it should not be framed as an abnormality that needs to be cured as that could be seen criticism in the public eye and using the argument of overall health also includes those that are not obese. He added that obesity should be referenced but only as one of many chronic health care conditions that could be improved.

Dr. Wu added that “physical activity” is an appropriate term rather than exercise

Brady stated that the bullets in the case work well however she felt that the committee needed a bigger vision statement agreeing with the previous argument that there needs to be data driven tangible outcomes. She added that the case still felt more like an argument for biking but not specifically for trails and that there should be a bullet included that emphasized why trails over other infrastructure.

Steve Faulstick agreed with Brady’s point and added that stripping the roads benefits bikers but trails benefit the entire community, the major differentiation is that trails are inclusive of everyone.

Brady asked him to clarify what would be the benefit to “everyone”.

Faulstick added that stripping predominately benefits bike commuters where as the trail program benefits the same commuters but also families, those using it for physical activity and being more inclusive of the community in general.

Dr. Wu stated that safety may be the argument to focus on, adding that he personally would bike more on a dedicated path due to safety issues.

Brady stated while some people don't feel safe on trails that safety is potentially an important argument in the discussion of "why trails".

Dr. Wu added that Scott Bricker could quote from statistics the BTA has stating that 1/3 of the population may be dedicated cyclist but possibly up to 1/2 would consider cycling if they had a place to do so.

Bricker commented that there is a host of research that shows that bicycling around traffic is a major concern. He added that the BTA had more antidotal information regarding percentage, in Portland about 7-8 % of people will ride but have concerns, 1 % will ride anywhere at anytime and about 60 percent or more of the population like to ride and would expand how they use it if it was safe. He stated that providing facilities for people to use is like providing technology, there are many different ways to provide technology and over the course of time the innovation is expected to improve. Paths are like one form of technology or product that could be provided out of several that are available. Bricker added that trails are recognized as the top facility type that could provide comfortable and convenient access that reaches people. Trails are really one way to provide a service.

Chair Yaden comment that from his point of view trails are qualitatively different as a form of infrastructure and he felt he could argue that.

Brady asked Chair Yaden if he could expand on the argument so it could be pieced into a bullet

Chair Yaden stated "Trails work -- they get people out of there cars and get bicycles off the roads in numbers that are significant to the transportation system and way that enhance rather than detract from communities. They get people to where they need to go while they are making themselves happy and healthy along the way. They enhance community in a way that other technologies do not. They provide a multitude of benefits that expand and enhance communities rather then detract from them. We see this in property values and economic development possibilities. People love them and want them, they might understand that they need the other forms of technology in bicycling infrastructure that we clearly do but these are something add up so many benefits in so many ways that in future years people will look back and say like Tom McCall Park, like MAX how could we not have seen the addition that these gave to our community, why couldn't we

foresee that these would be part of that greater green infrastructure that so define Portland.”

Yolles added that there is a bigger vision around trails because they are not just about biking but also walking and other forms of recreation that bike lanes do not provide, trails are inclusive.

Commissioner Schouten added that when you are on a bike lane you have to worry about car activity such as curve cuts, doors opening, right hooks, and sudden lefts in addition to the exhaust and the noise. Trails are a more comfortable environment.

Bricker commented that there is a difference between a bike lane and a bike boulevard. He added that while trails could be considered the “top dog” of cycling infrastructure there are other ways to provide that qualitative experience using the example of *woonerf* in the Netherlands (def: a street or group of streets where pedestrians and cyclists have legal priority over motorists). He added that while he doesn’t agree that trails are the only way to provide it they may be painted as the best way and worthy of the extra investment

Commissioner Schouten added that we cannot get hung up in the terms and should keep the case statement short and sufficient.

Brady commented that funders can’t argue with the four bullets in the case statement but another bullet is needed expressing how trails define communities and increase community experience because the four pieces could be solved with bike lanes.

Chair Yaden asked the committee if they all agreed with Eileen’s comment that community should be built more into the case statement

Chris Enlow pointed to the Trust for Public Land article (see attached) where the idea appeals to the ideas of legacy of social, environment and economy. He suggested starting with that, keeping it simplified, stating the case with the three buckets mentioned and linking it to the vision at a higher level. The point of view is the clarity of it.

Oregon State Trails Coordinator Rocky Houston commented that trails bring Mayberry back into the urban landscape “trails are the new front porch”

Al Jubitz stated that if the case statement is to avoid speaking about physical well being such as elimination of obesity they should think about the term mental health. He added that he had attended a national climate change conference where sociologists were brought in to discuss the topic of strong science vs. public inaction or what keeps people from moving. He suggested the committee invite an expert to comment on sociological benefits of a community that is

“connected green”. Jubitz used the example did the Portland area have less violence and domestic turmoil then other cities of the same size because of it’s investment in green infrastructure.

Dr. Wu agreed with Jubitz and suggested using the terms social and emotional heath instead of mental health. He added that the climate change argument can be brought into the arguments of health and social inequity--climate change will effect the poor population more quickly and more severely then populations that are well off.

Brady stated that another bullet could be that trails are a fraction of the cost of building a road and actual percentage of cost should be used.

Councilor Burkholder added that the case statement should quantify the cost of transportation to families and the case statement should be formatted in a different way to point to “Why trails and why now”.

Jay Graves agreed with Brady’s comments of bringing the family aspect into case statement and reinforcing the safety aspect because that is what keeps most people off of bike lanes not only for transportation but recreation as well. He also agreed that having as many points with statistics behind it will be critical to grabbing people’s attention right away.

Chair Yaden invited discussion on the point and counterpoint. He reminded the committee members to take the time to write an email to staff with short version of what they would like to see in the case statement and comments on the point and counterpoint or mark up their copies and pass them to Mike Wetter at the end of the meeting.

Commissioner Schouten commented that he wanted to have something included that related to the suburban portions of the region. He stated that trails are important in suburban areas because they typically they don’t have parallel neighborhood streets and have less of an opportunity for bike boulevards. He would also asked to have a map showing the existing or potential bike boulevards hooking into trails

Commissioner Schouten asked staff to expand on the reference to the Port of Rotterdam and how the busy port has used bicycle to get cars off the road to make it more open for it’s freight traffic.

Commissioner Schouten pointed to reference of weather being the number one impediment in preventing new converts to cycling and added the Netherlands and Denmark have worse weather then the Portland region which has not effected bicycling. He suggested if weather is truly the number one reason the argument should be further addressed.

Schouten commented he would like to see more discussion of reduced VMTs and the number of trips under 2-3 miles. He added that he had seen some statistics and would like to see some discussion on people's willingness to use a bike for these trips.

Dr Wu. commented on the page 4 counterpoint referencing confusing commuting and recreating. He felt the point could be stronger in hitting the way society relegates physical activity to when we are recreating which is not affective. He added that the argument should express the need to blend physical activity with everyday life, both when you're going to work and when you are recreating.

Chair Yaden urged the committee to write their notes on the point and counterpoint and pass them to Mike Wetter as to not consume the meeting

Chair Yaden asked the committee if they felt they had a significant enough case for the region to accelerate development of the trails system. He added that they should suspend what funding sources and how fast, just if they have the raw materials to make the case.

The Committee agreed that the idea of acceleration was significant enough to go to the community

Eileen added that accelerating the development actually significantly reduces the cost. She added that building segment by segment is more expensive due to mobilizing, federal administrative costs (30 %), and contingency (40%) of not being able to do them at the same time.

Yolles added that that should be part of the closing statement.

Chair Yaden thanked Brady and Jubitz for investing the extra time to meet with staff on the cost questions.

Councilor Burkholder added the cost is relative and needs to be looked at and communicated in terms of outcomes and performance relative to other transportation infrastructure. He used the example if you had to create car, bus or light rail infrastructure for all bike and pedestrian commuters to downtown the cost would be far greater.

Jubitz agreed with Councilor Burkholder and stated that it was necessary to chooses language that is relevant to the audience using percentages and avoiding terms in our data not familiar to the public such as kilograms. He added that facts needed to be related in terms the public uses and comparative in terms of how they live.

Mayor Kidd commented the case has the ammunition to go forward but it was necessary continue to fill in the gaps.

#### 4. Strategy questions and options presentation

Chair Yaden presented a PowerPoint (attached) highlighting the guiding principals, short term and long term funding and developing a strategy to be best positioned on the forefront.

#### 5. Strategy discussion

Chair Yaden invited the committee to participate in an initial discussion on strategies.

Commissioner Schouten commented that as with interstate highways there is an issue of standards that needed to be address. He added that trails needed to have a standard of predictability, comfort and signage that is lacking in our current system trails.

Chair Yaden added that committee member Potestio (not present) agreed and included in his comments that design was extremely important to the experience people have.

Councilor Burkholder commented that he would like to have existing transportation dollars to fix barriers referenced in the looking at in the package. He added that he would like to see safe crossing laid out, not just ODOT but cities and counties, anyone that has a facility blocking a trail.

Chair Yaden asked the committee to comment on the opportunistic approach vs. a systematic approach

Jubitz commented that when Eisenhower sold the 1956 highways system on cold war ethics of a national security issue adding that it took 3 decades to build and was developed by the “low hanging fruit” concept, the easiest places got the freeways fastest but they connected cities quickly. He also referenced the question “How did Portland get MAX?” stating most naysayers have gone away, even though it may not pay for itself the public still considers it good.

Jubitz added that there is a distinct transportation element to this and while the term trails does not speak to him the term multi modal does as well as the idea of separating modes of transportation for safety reasons. He felt that we should sell it as a transportation issue and separate the arguments for transportation and recreation in people’s minds.

Bricker commented on the Trail Story and that the funding box issue is a big question but he felt that the way things are currently funded was in those boxes. He added that in the beginning we might need to go from box to box, but in the

long term it might be possible to go across several boxes. He stated that in the short term to lobby in all areas would be effective.

Bricker added that he felt that building a complete trail and moving on that success was a more effective strategy than building pieces. He also commented that he felt the one trail authority was effective idea that could evaluate development and answer to the standards questions. Bricker commented on the problem of difficulty of acquisition and stated that although the Metro program does not take part in condemnation and emanate domain types of acquisition it may be something to look at going forward.

Graves referred to the “History of European Bicycle Mode share” article and requested examples of how they funded their mode share to see the types of increase they have.

Metro Staff member Janet Bebb responded that it was funded by taxes included gas tax

Bricker added that it is mostly at the national level, the countries are much smaller geographically and most funding comes from the national level as apposed to a regional bond measure approach.

Graves responded that we should then sit down with our congressional delegation and ask them the best ways of getting the system funded. He added that Portland is held up around the nation for it’s advancements in livable communities and this would seem a great opportunity to test pilot what could be done in bicycle and pedestrian commuting. He added that 30 years felt too long to him with so many benefits and partners there should be a way to treat it as something special when speaking to the congressional delegation.

Chair Yaden added that the way these projects typically get funded is that a group gets together around a project and then lobby for specific sums of money. He liked what Graves was suggesting in taking the vision, idea and case statement to friends /partners and involve them in the problem solving of carving off existing sources or creating new ones.

Councilor Burkholder commented that the metaphor of the light rail process is similar in that there is a system to be built and the funding pieces are thrown together. He added that it combines federal, local urban renewal dollars, bond money and even private partnerships and while the light rail is quite a bit more expensive it could be a good model to use.

Yaden added that Portland’s light rail was built because of a policy change that allowed cities to use its dedicated freeway money. Portland was the first city to respond.

Dr Wu commented that he felt the transportation argument is the most important. Referencing the meeting two breakout groups he suggested acting along the Max model in selecting 2 –3 trails out of 20 that connect the largest number of communities to be the initial starter trails and then later feed off of those.

Yaden asked Mayor Kidd and Commissioner Schouten being elected officials how they felt about this type of process.

Mayor Richard Kidd felt that that was good process referencing Bricker’s earlier comment to pick one and do the whole thing. He added that in doing this many different sources of revenue can be consolidated with a central control that gives us definition and standards. For economic reason however some portions may have it may have to pieced together in order to respond to opportunity. Mayor Kidd stated that condemnation acquisition is a “no go” adding that Metro uses willing seller/ willing buyer and there if there are unwilling buyers it will be expensive to acquire that piece of property. He believed the package should be presented as something beneficial to the community health wise, for recreational purposes and transportation purposes and added that in Washington County the elected officials had a meeting with Ron Wyden where some standout subjects were health care and transportation. The discussion of transportation included aspect providing something to improve the health of community.

Mayor Kid also commented that it was extremely important to have standards and definitions for trails.

Chair Yaden stated that there were two visions. The first is to set criteria and pick how to develop the system trail by trail or “MAX model” vs. pots of money for which many jurisdictions can compete. In the latter the emphasize would be to increase the size of the pot of money. He asked the committee to state which way they should lean

Yolles stated that it seemed that Chair Yaden had outlined a fundamental strategic choice and that there would be tension around that choice. He stated the dominant thinking of today was incremental in approach and tended to focus on short-term ways and look for single answers which could make the pots of money approach appropriate. He added that on the other hand the Max model could allow for new policy and the approach seems more consistent with the idea

Councilor Burkholder commented on the need to be bold and make sure the community was convinced by case statement that the project will solve many problems and give them something they really enjoy. He encouraged the staff to break numbers down into per household per month, which is more understandable in the public minds. He referred to bullet 3 on Strategic Issue: Development Strategy slide, stating he liked the idea of having a system concept based on a

criteria where everyone can compete and can come up with a local match but there would need to be a source to help them.

Schouten commented that Senator Wyden had mentioned that federal officials do not want to be selecting between conflicting projects when locals have not figured out what they want. He felt that there needed to be 3 – 4 projects in each one of the principal parts of the region fairly soon so that every part of the region has a concrete example of a fully functional, maintained, signed trails that serves as a success story in there region. The success can then be built on.

Jubitz felt that we need the right of eminent domain and condemnation to raise the bar to get it done.

Mayor Kidd stated that it was an attitude of the population in Oregon. He added it is even difficult for ODOT to do eminent domain for necessary transportation projects even when they want to widen the road.

Chair Yaden asked that the committee be prepared to discuss the controversial subject of condemnation and eminent at the next meeting.

Chair Yaden asked the committee to give a sense of which direction they would tend to lean, an effort that would require us to pick and choose and complete particular project or keeping a competitive process and building a pot of money where local advocates compete for funding of there individual projects.

Mayor Kidd stated that he leaned towards picking and choosing and completing a project but there needs to be master plan that list all of the projects and if a project isn't picked there is an understanding that it will continue to be worked on by advocates. He added that money should be used as soon as it becomes available and once a project is completed another group could be moved on.

Schouten stated 3-4 projects could be picked in specific areas to start but then there could also be a mixture of competitiveness adding he saw it as two different time periods

Yolles commented that in either scenario what is the criteria that would be used and how would projects be prioritize.

Chair Yaden told the committee that staff would generate some potential criteria for the next meeting.

Chair Yaden said that there had been enough information for staff to generate some strategic paths

Eileen asked if Congressman Blumenauer could attend one of the meetings in addition to targeting other potential leaders to come

Wetter told the committee that Congressman Earl Blumenauer had been invited but unable to attend. He added that staff was hoping to reschedule the October meeting so he could attend as well as possibly Congressman Peter Defazio

Bricker added that now that MAX is built there are many funding programs at the federal level and felt inviting the congressmen to meeting could be highly beneficial

## 6. Cost Reduction Strategies

Metro staff member Janet Bebb informed the committee that there had been brainstorming session with committee member Eileen Brady, Portland Parks staff member Gregg Everhart and Metro staff member Mary Anne Cassin regarding what makes the trails so expensive. She stated that one reason was the federal premium that could be address with our elected officials and the other is that there is no consistent funding source so it takes an enormous amount of time to go after small pots of money. She added that having no predictable systematic stream causes the small segments and a premium comes along with that. Bebb stated that in the current system we generally build 2-4 million dollar projects funded by 4-5 sources that take 5-10 years. Other problems included rising land costs, material cost escalation, and permitting. She added that there might be a way to streamline the permit and public bid processing to reduce cost.

Brady commented that every time there is work done on a segment there needs to be a permit obtained for the segment rather than getting one permit for the entire trail in addition to the Public process has to be done for each segment. She added that many of the processes were built around building roads so the same standard and mind set are applied to trails. There could be a large potential cost savings if changes could be made in the procedures. She suggested changing the problem statements into a solution package to present to our policy makers.

Jubitz commented that he would like to see a more detailed presentation on the cost. He asked staff to rethink the trail story as he had the mind set of a million dollars a mile yet when he divided the additional miles on the 5 years segments it can range up to 5-6 million a mile on 30 years. He added he would like to see a chart that also details the percentage of population piece.

Janet Bebb responded that is in fact not 1 million per mile adding that there are trails that can be built for 1 million dollars a mile but there are also those that are more like 10 million dollars a mile if it contains infrastructure such as a bridge. The numbers in the trail story reflect more of the average. She asked the committee not to think in terms of 1 million dollar a mile.

Chair Yaden asked the committee members who were planning on attending the field trip to see Mike Wetter after the meeting

Mike Wetter asked the committee to celebrate accomplishing their first milestone in the decision that the development of the trail system should be accelerated.

Robert Spurlock announced the Southwest Willamette Greenway Bike ride to take place on August 20<sup>th</sup> at 5 p.m.

#### 10. Adjourn

There being no further business to come before the Blue Ribbon Committee for Trails, Chair Dave Yaden adjourned the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

Prepared by Kristin Blyler  
Program Coordinator