

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting

Room 501, Metro Regional Center

Active Transportation Plan

July 19, 2012

SAC Members present: Katherine Kelly, Gresham,
Heidi Guenin, Upstream Public Health
Stephanie Routh, Willamette Pedestrian Coalition
Rob Sadowsky, Bicycle Transportation Alliance
Lidwien Rahman, ODOT
Roger Geller, PBOT
Aaron Brown, Youth Rep. / The Intertwine
Todd Borkowitz, Citizen Rep.
Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser, Clackamas County
Allen Schmidt, Portland Parks and Recreation
Hal Bergsma, Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation
Suzanne Hansche, Elders in Action
Shelley Oylear, Washington County
Kate McQuillen, Multnomah County
Eric Hesse, TriMet

SAC Members absent: Allen Berry, Fairview
Derek Robbins, Forest Grove
Jose Orozco, Cornelius
Jessica Engelmann, TriMet (represented by Eric Hesse)
Brad Choi, Hillsboro
Jeff Owen, Wilsonville (now at TriMet)

Metro staff and guests present: Lake McTighe, Anthony Butzek, Chris Myers, John Mermin, Kyle Goodman, Roger Averbeck (Mult. Co. BPCAC)

Introductions

Project Manager Lake McTighe opened the meeting. Committee members and guests introduced themselves.

ATP Project Update and Intro to the Existing Conditions Report

Ms. McTighe gave a brief refresher on project objectives, the timeline, next steps, and the contents of the existing conditions report. Committee members asked how, to whom, and in what format they should give feedback on the existing conditions report. Ms. McTighe stated that an email or word document with the comment or change, referencing the page number of the report would be fine. She offered to post a word version of the report on the ftp site if SAC members preferred to make comments in track changes.

Presentation on Findings/Opportunities from the Existing Conditions Report

Ms. McTighe and the committee reviewed the draft findings and opportunities from the report. Ms. McTighe walked through each of the findings and opportunities including mode share, household income, replacing short auto trips with walking or bicycling, use of arterial streets, the need to include bicycle and walking projects in roadway preservation projects, best-practice design guidelines to improve pedestrian and bicycle routes, and the lack of good data for bicycling and walking counts region-wide. John Mermin of Metro explained the cycle zone analysis, how it was created, and how it will be used for the Active Transportation Strategic Plan.

Discussion on Findings and Opportunities and Overall Report

Committee members discussed the use of demographic data within the report. Ms. McTighe noted that the 2011 OHAS demographic data would be replaced with 2010 Census data, but that it would not affect the mode share by race information.

Mr. Rob Sadowsky asked why three mile buffers were used for walking and biking respectively and not 2 mile buffers (finding C.), which he has seen used more often. Mr. Roger Geller responded that 3 mile buffers for bicycling and 1 mile buffers for walking are also typical. Ms. McTighe stated that Metro has data on trip length from under 1 mile to 30 miles.

Ms. McTighe, in discussing finding D, noted that many of the regional bicycle and pedestrian routes are also arterials. Mr. Hal Bergsma of THPRD asked whether arterial street use (for bicycling and walking) is consistent throughout the region (urban vs. suburban). Ms. McTighe responded that depending on context use could be different, but that the arterials on the regional bicycle and pedestrian maps were typically also transit corridors and high use corridors.

In response to finding D, Ms. Shelley Oylear of Washington County discussed the importance of explaining, within the report, that most arterials are used by all modes for many types of trips because they often are the most efficient, quickest way (route) between two points, and that they are often the locations of major destinations and are also transit corridors.

Ms. Lidwien Rahman of ODOT noted that many (a large percentage) of the arterials/regional bike and ped corridors were also state highways, and that when they are district highways they tend to be a low priority for ODOT (e.g. there are no projects in the RTP to improve bicycling and walking on the facilities).

Ms. Stephanie Routh of the WPC asked how the 530 feet rule was determined for a crossing distance in the RTP (finding I). Ms. Rahman stated that the rule is derived from Metro's Complete Streets guide. Mr. Anthony Butzek of Metro stated that it is a minimum requirement.

During discussion of finding K, Ms. McTighe noted that the funding chapter still needed a lot of work. Committee members expressed a desire to clearly show the different funding sources.

Ms. Routh stated that funding is not only about the amount of funding available, but how it is allocated. There is not necessarily a lack of funding; if how funding was reprioritized there could be enough funding to build out all of the active transportation projects. She suggested that this be included in the findings and opportunities.

Ms. Lidwien Rahman of ODOT expressed the challenge of separating out funding for bike and ped projects as many jurisdictions define projects as multi-modal, and do not identify the separate improvements to bike and ped system.

Mr. Bergsma noted there could be concern about the “2%” funding amount for active transportation because of bike and ped improvements included in roadway projects. He also noted that the Washington County MSTIP has included a \$175 M opportunity fund that bike and ped projects are eligible for.

Mg. Roger Geller of Portland stated that it is important to include the percentage breakdown of funding going to different modes, and that the amount spent on bike and ped projects is quite small compared to the other modes. He also stated that there is a difference between targeted funding for active transportation projects and those that are folded into multi-modal projects. He noted that the multi-modal projects are primarily for the benefit of the roadway and will often improve or add a short segment of sidewalk or a bike lane that do not connect to other bike and ped facilities, where as stand-alone bike and ped projects are designed as complete projects from the active travel perspective.

Ms. McTighe acknowledged these comments. She stated that in the report it would be clearly stated when “bike and Ped” funding was only including dedicated bike and funding, and would clearly state that some “roadway” projects can include bike and ped enhancements. She further stated that she would focus on funding for capital investments and separate out maintenance funding to make it clearer.

Committee members discussed whether there should be findings, opportunities and/or recommendations within the existing conditions report. Members expressed that clearly separating the findings from the opportunities would be appropriate for the existing conditions report rather than mixing findings and recommendations/opportunities. The committee voted to include both findings and opportunities, clearly identified as such.

Mr. Eric Hesse of TriMet stated that it might be helpful to categorize the findings and opportunities into: existing conditions findings, policy questions, and implementation strategies.

Ms. Katherine Kelly stated that it would be helpful in the funding chapter to include information on the approximate costs of building out different pedestrian and bicycling projects to demonstrate the low cost of these projects (compared to some other transportation projects).

Ms. Oylear stated that focusing on the low cost of bike and ped projects could lead to an interpretation that not much funding was needed.

Mr. Bergsma wanted to clarify that the RTP maps in the Existing Conditions report are from 2010 and that parts of the system have been built since then. He also that although a facility may exist it may not meet current design standards. As an example a four foot wide community trail should, by current design standards, be 8 feet at minimum.

Ms. McTighe responded, yes the maps are from 2010 and that would be clearly stated in the report and that if provided with a list of new projects that information could be included in the report.

Ms. Heidi Guenin of Upstream Public Health asked about how these projects will get funded especially in light of the change in how projects are funded through ODOT, where bike and ped projects will be competing against many other types of projects, and with no clear criteria. Ms. McTighe responded that she will be including a section describing the new and proposed funding.

Roger Averbeck (interested citizen) – Expressed his concern for limited funding for the bike and ped system and that these issues should be acknowledged in the existing conditions report.

Mr. Roger Geller of the City of Portland discussed the need to include in the report a stronger tie to specific policies, in the policy framework section, regarding active transportation such as Portland's climate action plan.

Ms. Rahman noted that Chapter. 7, criteria should look at including Washington County's criteria from the recent bike and ped project prioritization.

Mr. Sadowsky stated that chapter titles at the bottom of the page would be helpful.

SAC members identified additional findings/opportunities to include in the Findings/Opportunities section of the report:

Mr. Aaron Brown of the Intertwine expressed the importance of showing the multiple benefits of these types of projects, and the multiplier benefits (e.g. a project that benefits water quality also benefits bike and ped safety)

Ms. Stephanie Routh of the WPC discussed the importance of showing the worker/employee productivity lost or not lost based on project funding such as bike lanes to employment centers.

Mr. Sadowsky stated that the economic benefits (workforce/employer benefits) should be included as a finding.

Mr. Sadowsky recommended including the finding from the Metro Safety Report on the cost of crashes to the region.

Ms. Rahman recommended including more language on the overlap of state highways and the regional active transportation system.