MEETING SUMMARY

Active Transportation Plan | Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting 3:00-5:00 p.m., Feb. 19, 2013

SAC Members present:

Rob Sadowsky, Bicycle Transportation Alliance

Katherine Kelly, Gresham Todd Borkowitz, Citizen Rep.

Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser, Clackamas County

Kate McQuillen, Multnomah County

Jeff Owen, TriMet

Shelley Oylear, Washington County

Roger Geller, PBOT

Stephanie Routh, Willamette Pedestrian Coalition Jessica Horning, ODOT (for Lidwien Rahman)

SAC Members absent: Brad Choi, Hillsboro

Aaron Brown

Allen Berry, Fairview

Derek Robbins, Forest Grove

Jose Orozco, Cornelius

Allen Schmidt, Portland Parks and Recreation Hal Bergsma, Tualatin Hills Parks and Recreation

Suzanne Hansche, Elders in Action

Metro staff and guests present: Lake McTighe, John Mermin, Robert Sprulock, Anthony Buczek and Crista Gardner (Metro); Matt Berkow (Alta Planning), Sumi Malek (CH2MHill)

NOTE: March meeting moved to April 4.

Meeting overview (PPT attached)

- Lake McTighe briefed the SAC on the steps for finalizing the plan and Metro Council adoption. The Council will be asked to vote on a Resolution of "intent to support" adoption of the plan as part of the RTP during the regular update of the RTP. The RTP update will be finalized in the summer of 2014. Lake noted that the ATP will include a list of recommended projects for inclusion in the RTP.
- Lake gave an update on the timeline.
- Lake pointed out that copies of revised materials from the January meeting were included in the
 meeting packet. Revisions had been sent out after the Jan. meeting for SAC comments, and while there
 was no time scheduled on the agenda for discussion of revisions SAC members could email Lake or the
 entire committee.
- Lake noted that a draft of the Regional Destinations map was nearly finalized and that a draft would be sent to the SAC for comments via email.

- Lake gave an update on stakeholder engagement to date and upcoming scheduled presentations and asked for suggestions on other groups to reach out to, including May 9 Open House. SAC members suggested: Freight (regional and Portland), Schools (perhaps a school district), TriMet Board, Parks and Trails departments (make sure staff are at county coordinating meetings).
- Todd Borkowitz asked if Lake would send out the list of invitees to the ATP Open House, so that additions could be made. Yes. Lake also will ask SAC members to spread the word. Lake will bring the proposed event brief for the open house to the SAC's next meeting.

Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Network Concepts (revised draft attached – maps posted to ftp site)

Lake briefly went over the handout on the pedestrian and bicycle network concepts. She noted that one suggested change was to call Regional Bikeways Community Bikeways to avoid confusion. She also noted that the "local bikeways" and "local pedestrian connectors" would most likely not be shown on the final RTP maps (too dense to display) but would be described as part of the overall concept.

Lake pointed out the "functional class and design types" table on page 3 of the concept document and noted that this is an approach that would help establish design types and corresponding design guidelines for the different functional classes. The "prioritization tiers" on page 4 is an example of how identified projects might be organized, illustrating the transition from the overall vision/concept to the implementation strategy.

Lake asked for input from the SAC in order to refine the concepts and get a thumbs up on the approach for the design types and project tiering.

Ped Network Concept

- High frequency transit routes added not showing up on map (map will be reposted on the ftp site)
- Steph Routh noted that for ped and bike, connectivity within centers is very important, so prioritize all levels of bikeways and pedestrian access within centers.

Bike Network Concept

- Roger Geller stated the focus should not be on allowing for long distance and "regional" trips. All bike
 trips are of regional significance and most trips on bike will be short. Need to target short trips and
 completing a dense network that makes bicycling easy. One way to prioritize focus on one district or
 network at a time.
- Shelley Oylear stated that different areas of the region, some areas destinations are further apart and longer trips are being made, e.g. Tigard to Beaverton, Hillsboro to Bethany. So, the intra-regional travel is also important. Different areas of the region also have different cycling patterns. Washington County may have more long distance trips.
- Katherine Kelley stated that allowing for longer distance trips, connecting into the denser network, are also important for developing tourism opportunities which is important out in East County.
- Roger Geller agreed there are also longer trips but should not be the focus of the concept.
- Katherine Kelley and Jeff Owen noted that an identified spine is needed.
- Shelley and others asked that the bicycle model and pedestrian evaluation data be used to help inform where trips are being made and where "focus" areas should be.
- Then the concept can reflect that it is a regional priority to build a dense network in these areas –bike districts? Get away from 2040 centers being the only way to identify future need and growth. Use data or employment and population to help ID "centers" or districts.
- Roger Geller and Katherine Kelley supported idea of bike districts.

Ped Network analysis (see attached PPT slides)

Mat Berkow from Alta presented a draft map to illustrate the direction the pedestrian analysis is heading. Asked for feedback from the SAC on the way the analysis was being presented. Maps were handed out at the meeting. The maps were just to illustrate the approach – the analysis had not been finalized and the data displayed in the maps was not correct.

In general, the SAC thought the map looked good and the approach would

- Agreed on 1 mile buffer around corridors
- Jessica Horning asked if the corridors be further segmented out (since many of them are long and they
 change). Yes, the analysis will included analyzing the corridors by TAZ and identifying the segments
 with the most change and biggest impact (e.g. most access, most population, most destinations)
- It was suggested that the color scheme be flipped so that the dark colors emphasize the data that should stand out.
- Jeff Owen asked how corridors were identified. Lake responded that the corridors had been identified in the existing conditions phase of the project. Metro tried to keep the number of corridors below 100. A map and list of the corridor extents is included in the existing conditions report.
- Shelly Oylear asked if the needs analysis would then be "overlaid" with the access. Yes.

Benefits and Trade-offs report

Sumi Malik from CH2MHill gave an overview of the proposed outline of the benefits and trade-offs report. Sumi also asked for the SAC to provide resources and sources of studies to help support the findings in the report.

- What is the purpose of the report? Lake and Sumi explained that the report would compile the outputs
 from the bike and pedestrian network evaluations and provide additional analysis and summations on
 the benefits the region can expect to enjoy with investment in active transportation and the trade-offs
 or considerations (see point below) that need to be considered to effectively implement the networks.
- Roger Geller asked how safety is being measured. Lake noted that one measure will be the percent of trips on facilities separated from traffic.
- Roger Geller suggested looking at benefits in a \$/mile return on investment (e.g. \$ saved for every mile walked/biked).
- Consider renaming trade-offs section "considerations"
- Use an existing corridor as an example or case study in the considerations. Staff propose using Barbur Blvd. as an example.
- There were several questions and concerns about the proposed unit per mile costs for the cost estimates being too high and the proposed width for the sidewalk and bikeways. Lake is providing a memo with more information.