

Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Policy Advisory Committee Meeting #3 Summary

Wednesday, April 15, 2014 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Location: Chemeketa Center for Business and Industry, 626 High Street NE, Salem OR

Committee Members Present

Tammy Baney (Chair), *Oregon
Transportation Commission*
Steph Routh*, *Hopscotch Town*
Dennis Mulvihill, *Bicycle Transportation
Alliance*
Chris DiStefano*, *Rapha*
Jerry Breazeale, *City of Irrigon*
Peter Fernandez, *City of Salem*
Sid Leiken, *Lane County Commission*

Bob Russell, *Oregon Trucking Association*
Jenna Stanke, *Oregon Bike/Ped Advisory
Committee--Jackson County*
Steve Dickey, *Salem-Keizer Transit District*
Bob Joondeph, *Disability Rights Oregon
Commission*
Jerry Norquist, *Cycle Oregon*
Sally Russell, *Bend City Council*

Committee Members Absent

Craig Campbell, *AAA Oregon/Idaho*
Mark Labhart, *Tillamook County*
Dan Thorndike, *Medford Fabrication*

ODOT Staff Present

Jerri Bohard, *Transportation Development
Division Administrator*
Margi Bradway, *Sustainability Manager*
Mac Lynde, *Active Transportation Section
Manager*
Sheila Lyons, *Bike/Ped Program Manager*
Stephanie Millar, *Senior Planner*
Amanda Pietz, *Transportation Planning
Unit Manager*
Lucia Ramirez, *Principal Planner*

Consultants Present

Peter Lagerwey, *Consultant Project
Manager--Toole Design Group*
Jeanne Lawson, *Facilitator--JLA Public
Involvement*
Jamie Harvie, *JLA Public Involvement*

Members of Public Present

Bill Holmstrom, *Oregon Department of Land Conservation & Development*
Mike Jaffe, *MPO Area Program Manager*

*Attended by phone

Key Meeting Outcomes

The purpose of this meeting was to review and refine the preliminary vision and goals and agree on a working draft. The PAC:

- Reviewed and provided direction on the draft vision and goal themes
- Discussed the work planned to establish an understanding of bicycling and walking in Oregon today.

Action Items:

- Members should subscribe to the plan website (<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/bikepedplan.aspx>) and pass it along to their constituents.
- Members should pass along suggestions for information or data sources to Lucia Ramirez.
- Project staff may ask PAC members for suggestions to address gaps in TAC membership.
- Members should provide staff with their named alternates if they plan to have one.

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Commissioner Tammy Baney, PAC Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Jeanne Lawson of JLA Public Involvement explained the purpose of the meeting and reviewed the agenda. PAC members, project team members, and audience members introduced themselves.

Review 2-19-14 Meeting Summary

It was noted that Phil Warnock needs to be added to the meeting summary as absent. There were no other comments.

PAC Member Report Outs

Jeanne asked PAC members to report on who they have spoken with about the plan and to share any issues and concerns they have heard. Dennis Mulvihill said the BTA Director provided feedback that he was happy with the outcomes of the last meeting and was glad that safety and health were identified as priorities. Jerry Breazeale said that the Northeast ACT will meet in August and he is on the agenda to provide an update about the bike/ped plan. He has also provided an update to the Irrigon City Council.

Presentation and Discussion of Draft Vision

Amanda Pietz, ODOT Transportation Planning Unit Manager, explained how the vision and goals work fits into the plan development process. She reminded the group that the plan will be a statewide policy document that sits under the Oregon Transportation Plan and considers biking and walking within the context of the transportation system.

Chairperson Baney explained that today's discussion will focus on the vision, and that the vision will guide all plan activities. She said that the goal of the group today is not to wordsmith, but to consider the overall intention of the vision and goal themes. The vision and goals will be a starting framework to move forward, but will continue to be refined and defined as the process goes on.

Peter Lagerwey, Consultant Project Manager, asked the group to review the summary of the previous meeting's discussions regarding the vision and goals. The project team has tried to capture the sentiments from PAC comments in the February meeting in the draft vision and goal themes. In particular, he noted the term "pedestrian" has been replaced with "walking." Chairperson Baney said she liked to see that, although committee members come from different perspectives, their overall direction seem to be aligned.

Peter presented two versions of the vision statement (see Appendix A). One is shorter and has a higher-level focus; the second is longer and provides more detail. Peter reviewed the statements and how they reflect the input received by the PAC. Peter asked PAC members to divide into pairs to discuss the visions and report out on what they like about them.

Discussion

The group discussed the merits of a more succinct versus more detailed vision statement.

- PAC members were evenly split on their preferences for the longer or shorter draft vision statements.
- Nearly all PAC members expressed a general preference for succinct vision statements; however, a number of committee members said that a more detailed vision is appropriate for the bike/ped plan because of its educative role.
- There was a concern that the vision not list things because once a list is created, it needs to be exhaustive or it runs the risk of leaving something out.
- It was suggested that the plan could include a succinct vision statement accompanied by an explanatory paragraph or that some of the detail from the longer vision could be expressed in the goals.

PAC members had the following input on specific wording of the vision statements:

- In the shorter vision statement, emphasize the word "transportation" and the theme of "recreation."
- "Equitable" needs to be included in the shorter vision.
- The inclusive language in the longer vision ("People of all ages and incomes have safe and secure access") should be included in the longer vision. The end of this sentence could be simplified to simply "to where they want to go".
- The longer vision statement focuses too much on "connectivity" and on the link between biking and economic development.
- The word or concept of "abilities" needs to be included. This is especially important since "pedestrian" has been changed to "walking" and not everyone walks.
- How "choice" is articulated is important, because some people do not have a choice in their mode of transportation.
- Unclear what the word "comfort" means.
- Consider use of the term "bike, walk and roll."
- The word "integrated" has connotation of fitting bike/ped facilities into the road system instead of being an essential part. "Intermodal" or "embodiment" were suggested alternatives.
- The emphasis on economic development in the longer vision statement needs more balance between biking and walking.

PAC members raised the following points that should be considered in revising the vision:

- Need to acknowledge all of Oregon – urban, suburban and rural.
- Tourism: Need more balance between urban and rural. Visitors travel through urban areas to get to rural recreation areas. Urban areas have the growth in bike/ped tourism, such as bike share programs.
- Bike/ped facilities are important to the economic vitality of cities for locals, too – not only for connections and tourism.
- One committee member was concerned how the term “cost-effective transportation” would translate in implementation.
- The concept of health is missing from the longer vision statement.
- Transportation centers are important for an intermodal system.
- Some committee members were for and some were against distinguishing between “recreation” and “transportation.” It was noted that this distinction is not made for vehicle travel.
- The vision needs to speak to those who are not involved with or familiar with bicycle and pedestrian issues. It needs to have an educative element. This can have an impact on funding.
- Biking and walking should be an essential part of every transportation system.

A PAC member asked who the primary audience is for this vision statement. Project staff replied that it will be used by stakeholders across the state that are involved in transportation, by the OTC as a guiding document, and by agencies as part of developing their own plans and in implementing planning efforts.

Chairperson Baney wrapped up the discussion. She expressed concern that she felt the group was focusing heavily on concepts of on return on investment or tourism dollars and that the plans should help to build a statewide system that embraces and supports Oregon’s communities. She supports a succinct vision statement and is not opposed to the idea of a clarifying paragraph and suggested the inclusion of a placeholder as the team revises the vision.

Exercise to Refine Preliminary Plan Goals

Peter asked PAC members to pair up and review the goal statements and provide feedback about whether the emphasis is correct.

Discussion

The group discussed the difference between goals and objectives. Goals should focus on the desired outcome and objectives should define how to get there. The current draft goal themes appear to include a mix of goals and objectives.

The committee discussed whether the goals should be achievable or aspirational. Project staff noted that the timeframe of goals is something frequently discussed by modal plan committees; there is no standard. Some members of the group thought the goals should be more aspirational. In particular, several committee members were concerned with “reducing” bicycle and pedestrian fatalities – saying that the ultimate goal should be “eliminating” fatalities.

Two committee members commented that the safety goal theme attempts to incorporate too many concepts and suggested simplifying the safety goal to focus on “providing a safe and secure system for all users.”

One PAC member felt that the Coordination and Collaboration goal should include more of a focus on leadership, and that this plan should provide leadership and support for other jurisdictions. Another PAC member felt that the word “leadership” could imply that ODOT is superior, whereas the goal should be about jurisdictions working together.

Other suggestions included:

- The goals need to build and meet expectations, but also build in flexibility.
- Need to include consistent, sustainable funding either under a category or as its own category.
- Safety needs to include a clearer description of good design and rules of the road.
- Make it clear that bike/ped is an essential part of all transportation design. This can support sustainable funding.
- Need to include management of the system, e.g. maintenance.
- A committee member noted that some of words bring to mind other connotations, which could affect people’s interpretation of the goals.

PAC members had the following input on specific wording:

- One PAC member said she would like to see either “intentional” or “intuitive” included in the goals, in the context of creating a seamless experience.
- The term “accessibility” may be narrower than what is intended; brings to mind ADA.
- “Equity” can have a lot of different interpretations.
- Consider separating or reversing “economic and community vitality”
- The word “leadership” implies that one party is superior. “Coordination and Cooperation” – like collaboration; “leadership” implies ODOT is superior

Peter wrapped up the discussion, saying that the project team will come up with working drafts of the vision and goals, which will be revisited again later in the project.

Intro to research: Understanding Biking and Walking in Oregon

Peter Lagerwey said the next step in the planning process is an analysis of existing conditions. The intention of the process is to get a comprehensive picture of biking and walking in Oregon today in order to understand gaps, issues and opportunities. He said the process will be cognizant of what is happening around the state at all levels, from state-wide to local jurisdictions, but will not focus on physical infrastructure. The three key areas of consideration are plans, projects, and programs; funding processes, policies, and sources; and bicycle and walking data resources. Amanda Pietz said that the project team wants to understand biking and walking within the transportation system and also the characteristics of communities that will lead to higher rates of biking and walking.

Peter said that the analysis is underway and will continue through June. Following the initial existing conditions report, they will develop an issues and opportunities memo.

- The group discussed data sources. One committee member noted that there is not as much data on bike/ped as other modes of transportation. Peter Lagerwey said that some of the data they consider will relate to all modes, such as speed or crash data. They will also consider socioeconomic and public health data. Identifying data gaps will also be an important part of the process.

- A PAC member said that the plan should not focus only on existing data and trends but also opportunities for encouraging behavior change. Jeanne Lawson noted that feedback from stakeholder interviews both in and out of ODOT mirrored this sentiment.
- A committee member said it will be important to work out how to analyze and use the data.
- Another PAC member suggested looking at school district data and to consider median ages.
- The committee discussed what the geographical focus of the analysis will be. The project team said they will research best practices around Oregon and also in other states. Also, they would like to consider transportation plans from around the state, both examples of good TSPs and average TSPs (how do they address bike/ped?). The project team will be conducting interviews to collect undocumented information.
- One committee member noted the need to consider things that are anticipated but don't necessarily have data, such as climate change.
- Another PAC member said that aging communities and disadvantaged communities are important to consider.

Peter asked committee members to let the team know through Lucia of any suggestions for information or data that would be useful to the planning process, particularly in rural areas.

Update on the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Lucia Ramirez, ODOT Planner and Plan Project Manager, provided an update on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The project team is getting close to forming the TAC; and they will have their first meeting prior to the next PAC meeting. Staff may ask PAC members for recommendations for technical experts in particular areas. Lucia explained that the role of the TAC is to be advisory to the PAC and delve in to questions the PAC would not have time to discuss in detail.

- One committee member asked whether ODOT still plans to have multiple TACs. Lucia said that they anticipate having one main TAC, as well as a few separate focus groups.

Plan Communications

Amanda Pietz said they are currently working on the communications plan for the bike/ped planning process to ensure they are getting meaningful feedback and engagement. She reviewed the communications and outreach the project team plans to do at various stages in the process. She noted that the project team will try to go beyond giving only presentations to truly engaging key stakeholder groups.

Jeanne noted that, as a working group, the PAC is not responsible for reviewing all public feedback; this is the OTC's responsibility. The project team will try to provide as much information as the group needs, but not overwhelm them with too much information. All public comment is public record and is available for anyone to see.

Amanda asked PAC members to subscribe for the plan website if they have not already done so (<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/bikepedplan.aspx>) and to pass it along to interested parties. She noted that there is a lot of interest in the current plan, which is an opportunity. The challenge is being able to process and use all the feedback they will receive.

- A committee member asked if ODOT will advertise/distribute project information and surveys. The project team said they will use a multi-faceted approach; information will be put on the ODOT website and then distributed in various ways, including through PAC members. One PAC

member noted that re-sender lists can be effective. Another committee member asked the team when announcing opportunities to participate to emphasize why this process is important to the stakeholders.

- Amanda noted that the report-outs at the beginning of PAC meetings are a way to capture more open-ended comments that PAC members hear from stakeholders.

Public Comment

Mike Jaffe, MPO Area Program Manager, said he is excited about level of discourse so far. He said that MPOs can play a valuable role in this process. His MPO has provided a lot of funding and data to bike/ped projects and they also collaborate with state and local jurisdictions. He offered to provide input as part of the stakeholder interviews.

Wrap up & Next Steps

Jeanne Lawson said that two committee members have identified alternates. If any others would like to name an alternate who has not done so, please do so quickly. This information or any suggestions for data/resources should be provided to Lucia.

Next PAC meeting will be June 10 in State Office Building, 800 Oregon Street, Portland. The meeting will focus on existing conditions.

Chairperson Baney said that she would like to ensure this group has time to buy into the vision and goals. This may be something that can be done between meetings. A number of PAC members expressed that they would like as much time as possible to review materials in the future, particularly the next iterations of the visions and goals.

Jeanne thanked everyone for coming and adjourned the meeting.

Appendix A: Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Draft Vision and Goal Areas

DRAFT VISION FOR THE OREGON BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PLAN

Drawing from the input of the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) at the February meeting and during PAC member interviews, consultants and staff have developed two sample vision statements for the PAC's consideration. It is anticipated that the PAC will discuss these possible vision statements and may select one; may refine one; or may suggest that elements of the two vision statements are drawn together.

1. In Oregon, people can choose bicycling or walking because a safe, integrated and well-connected network is provided. The network meets the needs and enhances the experience of the user and their sense of safety and comfort. Investment in bicycling and walking is recognized as contributing to the health of Oregonians, the economic and social vitality of communities, and as a cost efficient use of transportation dollars.
2. People of all ages and incomes have safe and secure access to neighborhoods, schools, jobs, businesses, and more by biking and walking. Biking and walking is supported by well-connected and maintained infrastructure that takes into consideration the needs of local communities. Biking and walking occur within and between cities and towns; population centers are connected along key highways or county roads; and people in rural areas can bike or walk to bus stops, carpool areas and other destinations. Facilities are integrated with other modes, taking into account potential users and trip purposes. Oregon's economic vitality is enhanced through tourism, including bicycle tourism, and the tourism and outdoor industries.

DRAFT GOAL AREAS

Following are suggested goal areas for the Plan, and a description of the themes within each goal area. These are developed from and informed by PAC and stakeholder comments in interviews and in the PAC visioning workshop. It is anticipated that the PAC will discuss these goal areas and themes and suggest ways in which they should be refined to better express the committee's intent for achieving the outcome of a successful Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for Oregon. This may include (but is not limited to) consolidating, eliminating or adding goal areas or refining goal themes. Policies and strategies will eventually be developed under each of the goals and it is anticipated that goal themes, policies and strategies will be developed and discussed throughout the course of Plan development.

Goal: Safety

Goal themes: Reduce bicycle and pedestrian fatalities and serious injuries by setting expectations and building understanding for the following: how investments in infrastructure can reduce crashes for all modes; how traffic management practices can reduce crashes for all modes; how education

and enforcement can reduce crashes for all modes; and how agency decision making (e.g. prioritization) can be structured to focus on improvements in safety. Support the use of context sensitive design solutions that improve safety, improve the user experience (level of comfort, perceived sense of safety) and support other community goals.

Goal: Mobility and Efficiency

Goal themes: Improve the mobility and efficiency of the entire transportation system by providing biking and walking options for trips of short and moderate distances such as those between home, work, school, and shopping. Preserve and maintain biking and walking facilities to help assure people can continue to move efficiently by bike, foot, or mobility device.

Goal: Accessibility and Connectivity

Goal themes: Improve the accessibility and connectivity of the transportation system by ensuring safe, direct and convenient connections between biking and walking routes and between biking and walking routes and other modes, especially public transit. Promote understanding of the connection between user experience (level of comfort, perceived sense of safety) and levels of bicycling and walking. Additionally, ensure that all users, including children, the elderly and persons with disabilities can access desired destinations through connections along and across roadways.

Goal: Economic and Community Vitality

Goal themes: Support the connection between biking and walking (active transportation) and economic and social vitality. Emphasize the role of active transportation in supporting access to jobs and economic centers, in attracting business to locate in Oregon, in supporting tourism, and contributing to community health and livability.

Goal: Equity

Goal themes: Work to understand, accommodate, and balance the needs of all users of the transportation system including those in urban, suburban and rural settings and of all ages, abilities, races and incomes. Strive to address the needs of those who have mobility challenges and work to provide biking and walking options to those who do not drive.

Goal: Health

Goal themes: Encourage active and healthy lifestyles by improving transportation options such as biking and walking and enhancing mobility choices for children, the elderly and persons with disabilities. Support land-use patterns that bring services closer to neighborhoods (e.g. patterns that increase walking and biking).

Goal: Sustainability

Goal themes: Support federal, state and local sustainability and environmental goals through the provision of zero emission modes like biking and walking.

Goal: Investment

Goal themes: Convey how bicycle and pedestrian projects can provide cost effective and sustainable solutions that may reduce overall systems costs. Support creation of a decision making structure that recognizes the contribution and value of bicycle and pedestrian investments, including

investment in preservation and maintenance. Improve understanding of strategic education and enforcement investments.

Goal: Coordination and Cooperation

Goal themes: Support cooperation among state, regional and local agencies in pursuit of complementary plans, consistent application of design treatments, and a coordinated effort that helps users easily and seamlessly transition between jurisdictional boundaries.

Goal areas of the Oregon Transportation Plan

- Goal 1 – Mobility and Accessibility
- Goal 2 – Management of the System
- Goal 3 – Economic Vitality
- Goal 4 – Sustainability
- Goal 5 – Safety and Security
- Goal 6 – Funding the Transportation System
- Goal 7 – Coordination, Communication and Cooperation

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/docs/otp/executivesummary.pdf>