

Active Transportation Plan | Workgroup Meeting – Principles and Criteria
Room 401, Metro Regional Center | 4-5:30 p.m., Sept. 27, 2012

Workgroup participants

Brad Choi, Hillsboro
Katherine Kelly, Gresham
Rob Sadowsky, Bicycle Transportation Alliance
Lidwien Rahman, ODOT
Roger Geller, PBOT
Todd Borkowitz, Citizen Rep.
Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser, Clackamas County
Hal Bergsma, Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation
Shelley Oylear, Washington County
Kate McQuillen, Multnomah County
Jeff Owen/Eric Hesse, TriMet
Heidi Guenin, Upstream Public Health
Lake McTighe, Metro
Anthony Butzek, Metro
John Mermin, Metro
Robert Spurlock, Metro
Sumi Malik, CH2MHill)

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss and develop draft principles and criteria that will be presented to the full ATP SAC on October 18.

Lake provided an overview of the steps involved in developing principles, criteria, network concepts and evaluating the network concepts. The draft network concepts will explore both a variety of network structures (e.g. hub and spoke, spider web, grid) and approaches (e.g. serve all centers equally, access to transit, Safe Routes To Schools, filling gaps, etc). The *Principles* will apply to all of the network concepts. These are elements that any network concept should have, e.g. safety. In addition to this set of principles, each individual concept will provide a unique approach to the active transportation network (e.g. serves commercial corridors). The *Criteria* will be used to evaluate the different network concepts in order to compare them and better understand the benefits and tradeoffs of each concept.

First the workgroup discussed the set of **draft principles** provided at the meeting and provided the following comments and guidance:

- There is need to further discuss the use of trails for utilitarian and recreational trips. One of the identified themes that emerged from the Sept. 6 meeting was that the active transportation network should focus on serving utilitarian trips in order to replace reduce trips made by car. The need to further discuss the role of the network, especially trails was raised and will be addressed at the Oct. 18 meeting.

- A network that is good for all, ages 8-80
- Include a principle about network developed based on data (data driven)
- Should “relieves strain on other transportation systems” be replaced with a principle where the network does not create problems for other modes? Or helps maintain traffic flow?
- Design the network to make it easier to walk and bike.
- On street routes with high speeds and traffic volumes should provide buffers
- Simplify the principles.
- Like the details in the principles, they help explain them.
- Spacing of network should be addressed in the different concepts (eg. Dense spacing, wider spacing, different patterns). Other ideas introduced that can be explored in the network concepts: a concept around commercial corridors; bikes and peds have different needs, provide concepts that address unique needs; a concept that focuses on serving pop, employment and destination densities; a concept that provides a variety of route choices; concepts that explore access in different ways (e.g. access to nature, access to jobs).
- Add a principle that addresses need for context sensitive approach.
- Discussion on the term “seamless” – is there a better term, may not be clear. Perhaps interconnected and linking? Staff chose to leave as is for now.
- Add principle to address equity. Included in safety principle and principle that network will increase access for low income and minorities.
- Other sources: Rob Sadowsky provided BTA principles as an example, Shelly Oylear recommended CNU Sustainable Street Network Principles, Hal Bergsma mentioned the work on STARS and Roger Geller said he could provide information on principles for network spacing that was developed for the Portland bike plan.
- What about principles that the network will reduce trips by car, reduce GHG emissions? Addressed in making bicycling and walking easy for all types of trips and increasing the number of trips.

After the principles discussion, the workgroup discussed the draft criteria. To narrow the criteria workgroup members were asked to identify four top criteria, after adding any criteria they thought were missing. Staff noted that they wanted to identify a limited set of three to six criterion to evaluate the network concepts.

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Number of “votes”</u>
Improve/increase access to destinations	15
Access to transit	0 (should be included in destinations above)
Safety	9
Improve/increase access for EJ communities	7
Add capacity/increase facilities	3 (will be covered by increase access)
Community support	2
Feasibility	4
Cost/funding available	2

ATP SAC Workgroup meeting notes Sept. 27, 2012

Increase in people walking/biking	6
Proximity to nature/water	1
Closes gaps	4 (will be covered by access/safety criteria)
Increase access to network	0
Choice of routes	1

Using this narrowing process staff will develop a set of draft criteria.