

**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**Active Transportation Plan | Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**2:30-5:00 p.m., May 9, 2013**

SAC Members present:

Rob Sadowsky, Bicycle Transportation Alliance  
Katherine Kelly, Gresham  
Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser, Clackamas County  
Kate McQuillen, Multnomah County  
Jeff Owen, TriMet  
Shelley Oylear, Washington County  
Roger Geller, PBOT  
Stephanie Routh, Willamette Pedestrian Coalition  
Lidwien Rahman, ODOT  
Brad Choi, Hillsboro  
Aaron Brown

SAC Members absent:

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  
Todd Borkowitz, Citizen Rep.

Metro staff and guests present: Lake McTighe, John Mermin, Robert Spurlock

**Bicycle network, evaluation report and parkway corridors**

Lake McTighe provided a brief overview of the findings from the Bicycle Network Evaluation Report and staff recommended bicycle parkways.

Shelly Oylear – if alternate routes are allowed there needs to be a clear review and approval process to formalize alternate routes and update RTP map to reflect alternate routes.

John Mermin- even if parallel route is designated as the bike parkway, there should still be a minimum bike treatment, i.e. bike lane on the route originally designated as a Bicycle Parkway.

Roger Geller – would be good to mention commercial zoning/destination on routes – we should keep the regional corridor on the main street because of the access it provides to so many destinations. Also, diagonals typically don't have a parallel route that's as direct.

Katherine Kelley– Burnside in vicinity of 187<sup>th</sup> – show the bicycle parkway on an alternate route (Yamhill). [*Change was made*]

Lidwien Rahman - How many miles are there in recommended bike parkway network? Would be good to include in plan. [*this was done*]

Roger – Portland comp plan – debate currently going on

- 1) Invest in areas with most population/highest density, OR
- 2) Invest in areas lacking basic infrastructure

Will Regional AT plan weigh in on this debate? Who decides?

Suggestion: Spell out what the outcomes are of choosing either option: Ask electeds to decide.

Lidwien – sidewalks vs bike routes might have different approaches for handling this debate, e.g. focus sidewalks where nothing exists. Focus bike routes in high use areas

Make sure prioritization lists are done by County. Response – yes – we're planning that already

Jeff Owen – keep in mind that when folks see the maps organized by cycle zone they may point out that certain areas within the zone might be different than the rest of the zone, e.g. underserved populations, potential for bicycling, 2035 activity.

Lake – yes, she'll reiterate these are broad brush measures.

Aaron Brown – couple of the frequent transit routes aren't really regionally significant for their entire length, e.g. bus from St John's to downtown via Hwy 30 is express, and doesn't have any stops, Bus on Burnside from downtown to Sunset transit center,

Shelly Oylear– make a map that shows where bike & pad parkways overlap. Think about how bike & pad priorities work together – since when you build a project, you're likely to address both modes at same time.

### **Pedestrian network improvements evaluation**

Lidwien - does not want to automatically add all new trails onto the RTP maps (especially concerned with Pedestrian map) or prioritize them as projects, before screening them to figure out which have transportation purpose. Are they in local TSPs?

Lake – we can have things on the map that are a low priority, but still need to be included in the vision.

Steph Routh– Show as much need as possible for project list.

Lake will provide more info on trails suggested to be added

Shelley – avoid showing trails on RTP map that are not eligible for federal \$

Robert Spurlock– these trails are part of regional network, even if not eligible for MTIP \$

Robert – Get trails shown on map to help get Federal \$ to do project development. During that study you figure out what surface & width is possible.

All comments – send to Lake by next Friday 5/17. Send marked up copies. Let her know if you don't like changes.

Evaluation report – send in any questions.

Workgroup meeting will be set up to look at project list & policy changes