

MEETING SUMMARY
Active Transportation Plan | Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
3:00-5:00 p.m., January 10, 2012

SAC Members present: Brad Choi, Hillsboro
Aaron Brown, The Intertwine
Kelly Clark (for Katherine Kelly) Gresham
Lidwien Rahman, ODOT
Todd Borkowitz, Citizen Rep.
Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser, Clackamas County
Hal Bergsma, Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation
Suzanne Hansche, Elders in Action
Kate McQuillen, Multnomah County
Jeff Owen, TriMet
Shelley Oylear, Washington County
Roger Geller, PBOT
Stephanie Routh, Willamette Pedestrian Coalition

SAC Members absent: Allen Berry, Fairview
Rob Sadowsky, Bicycle Transportation Alliance
Derek Robbins, Forest Grove
Jose Orozco, Cornelius
Allen Schmidt, Portland Parks and Recreation

Metro staff and guests present: Lake McTighe, John Mermin, Matt Berkow (Alta Planning)

Meeting overview

Lake McTighe gave a brief overview of the agenda and the desired outcomes of the meeting:

- Hear any further comments on the Active Transportation Network Principles and Criteria, and potentially finalize.
- Receive feedback on the revised methodology for evaluating the pedestrian network improvements.
- Discuss and agree on which destinations to include in the pedestrian network improvement evaluation.
- Receive feedback on the revised methodology for evaluating the bicycle network concepts.
- Review origin-destination trip pairs for bicycle model and ask for suggestions on additional trip pairs.
- Look at initial bicycle modeling results for the 2010 existing network and 2035 network to give an idea of what the evaluation will be providing us.

Lake announced that Heidi Guenin had resigned from the committee due to a change in her position and that the committee would need to bring in the health perspective.

Lake pointed to the project timeline and list of upcoming meetings. She noted that all of the SAC meetings had been scheduled through the end of the project. She also noted that she was starting to schedule presentations

on the plan in April with stakeholder groups and asked SAC members to contact her with any groups that should get a presentation.

Principles and Criteria, final revisions

SAC members reviewed the updated principles and criteria (changes made from the November meeting) and provided feedback. Lake noted that the process was pointing to continued fine tuning of the principles as the ATP was developed. She noted that the Metro Council would have an opportunity to provide input on the principles at their upcoming worksession in February. ***Suggested changes are attached.***

- Hal and Lidwien - Principle #1 –connections to all destinations or regional destinations? Add word regional before destinations in Principle #1 and Principle #7.
- Lori and other SAC members noted that still need to determine what falls under regional destinations.
- Hal – Principle #2, what does connected mean? Does it mean complete?
- Hal – what does data driven mean in #8?
- Roger – think this is trying to say that what you prioritize is based on measureable data
- Matt Berkow – suggest adding the word analysis?
- Kelly Clark- add “routes” to #1
- Kelly - #2 – intuitive for users? What is intuitive and for who? It is not clear
- Kelly – possibility to combine #3 and #5?
- Roger, Lidwien and Aaron – think that they should be separate.
- Kelly - #9 add word plans – implementing projects as well
- There was a discussion about including the word local in principle #9 – are regional and local goals and targets the same? If you include local and there are different goals or targets will it be confusing or lead to a less implementable regional plan? SAC seemed to land on leaving local in.

Updated pedestrian evaluation methodology

SAC responded to revised Alta memo on the methodology for analyzing improvements to the regional pedestrian network. ***Revisions based on feedback are attached.***

- Kelly – under criteria (first page) how are safety problems defined? Lake responded that Metro’s Safety Action Plan helps identify problem areas, locations of crashes; deficiencies and gaps on high traffic volume/speed roadways also indicate a less safe environment.
- Members reported difficulty in interpreting the equity/barriers map. This map shows roads that have one of the following conditions: 4+ lanes, 35+mph, 2,500+ vehicles during peak period. Lake will email out a link to a larger version of this map (Attached)
- Lidwien – page 5, need to clarify the difference between existing network and existing planned network. Also include map and description of the barrier network.
- Kelly – page 2 pedestrian travel assumptions – it is a big assumption to assume that all local streets are adequate for pedestrian travel. Lake responded that this was for the purpose of the analysis. This does not imply a policy. It is a technical approach – the GIS programming makes this assumption.

Destinations for evaluation and prioritization

SAC reviewed the memo describing Metro’s suggested approach to analyzing destinations. The SAC agreed to the approach overall. ***Revisions based on feedback are attached.***

- Question about which destinations are included in #8. Lake responded sites such as zoo, Rose Quarter, Jen Weld. A list will be included with the map that will be available at the next meeting.
- #9 – typo – it should say “200 monthly” not “daily” LIFT pickups. SAC agreed this made more sense.
- Confirm if hospitals and major health care providers are included in “social services”. Hospitals will be added using RLIS data.

- There was a discussion about how to capture office complexes and industrial areas that have clusters of employment. These will not be captured in #1, employers with more than 300 employees. Lake suggested reviewing the first draft of the “regional destinations map” and then deciding on next steps. Lidwien suggested (and Hal agreed) that it made more sense to focus on serving employment in 2040 centers, rather than office parks.
- Shelley – will there be enough difference in where employment is located in the future that the NAICS codes (which only captures the present and the plan is for the future) will not provide enough information. *Lake suggested overlaying the pedestrian network (and possibly the bike network) with the 2035 employment densities.*
- Lidwien suggested keeping destinations limited and noted that the regional destinations would help prioritize.
- Roger wondered if using a broader list of destinations was fine for the pedestrian analysis, since we’re not comparing alternative networks like in the bike analysis.
- Hal – need to make a difference between destinations for pedestrians and bicyclists. The travel distances are different. Lake noted that the average regional trip for pedestrians is ½ mile in the region.
- Roger – it makes sense for the bike system to use destinations such as centers.
- Hal – how do you define regional parks? Some Metro-owned parks don’t generate as much usage as some locally owned parks. Lori and Hal suggested providing a list of what were considered regional. Lake will follow up with them and others.
- Jeff Owen – a proof of concept from Alta would be helpful in trying to determine which destinations make sense to use.
- Matt asked the committee if all destinations are created equal in the analysis (should some be weighted differently?)
- Aaron asked to clarify the purpose of the ped analysis.
- Hal – are trails included? Lake, yes and a map showing them will be available at the next meeting.
- Matt noted once we have initial results it will be easier to discuss.

Updated bicycle network concept evaluation memo and preliminary bicycle modeling evaluation results for 2010 and 2035 bicycle networks

SAC provided feedback on revised

- Roger – stated that his understanding was that while the bicycle modeling tool was still being refined (only one study used to develop it) it was helpful for comparative evaluations at the network level. John noted that this was correct.
- John noted that we would learn a lot from the tool through this process.
- Aaron asked if the evaluation would tell us how to prioritize. Lake stated no, but the evaluation would provide information to inform the decision.
- Hal – what is a parkway? First time he has seen it on the maps. Lake – yes added it to the maps (network concepts) because the evaluation is focused on the regional bicycle parkways – first identified in the 2035 RTP, concept needs to be refined as part of ATP. Highest level classification for a bike facility.
- Roger asked if we can look at mode-split results by organized by the geographic sub-areas people live in.
- Roger asked if our modeling staff if can produce the 2035 trip pairs chart for trips < 5 miles. It currently includes CAZ pairs with the most trips between them (2035 Total daily person trips < 10 miles),
- *Note: revisions based on feedback on lane removal section of memo are based on feedback provided after the meeting.*

Origin-destination trip pairs (for bicycle network modeling and evaluation)

John Mermin went over the suggested origin and destination pairs. Lake asked for feedback if SAC members wanted to see additional O-D pairs included.

- Jeff - is it center to center or edge to edge that is modeled? John – It's all trips that begin (anywhere in the first zone and end anywhere in the 2nd zone)
- Brad – is it origin to destination and back to origin (round trip)? John – no, just origin to destination. Brad – why aren't the trips from zone X to Zone Y the same as the trips from zone Y to X? John – people make many different trips throughout the day, e.g. they may go from zone Y to zone Z before they return to zone X.
- Jeff - asked about the "reason" given for the O-D pair. Do we need to provide? John, no just helps explain why the pairs were chosen.