



Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Issues and Opportunities Report

July 2014



Contents

1.0 - Introduction	3
2.0 – Issues and Opportunities by Goal Area.....	4
Appendix A: Reviewed Plans.....	21
Appendix B: Interviewed Communities	25



1.0 - Introduction

This report provides a high level summary of key issues and opportunities in Oregon bicycle and pedestrian planning. Issues were identified through an evaluation of gaps in active transportation planning in Oregon, as outlined in the *Existing Conditions Review of Oregon Transportation Planning* (see Appendix A for a list of plans reviewed as part of the Existing Conditions report). In addition, interviews with several local and regional agencies helped refine the issues and opportunities discussed in this report (see Appendix B for a list of communities interviewed and topics discussed).

The report also discusses the gaps identified in the Existing Conditions Review and explores the potential impact of these gaps on transportation outcomes in Oregon. As further information is derived from other information sources, like surveys, interviews, and listening meetings, this report will continue to be updated to capture these opportunities and challenges.

The report introduces each of the nine Plan goal areas and provides a summary of how each goal is addressed in active transportation planning resources (including state, regional, and local plans and policies). For each goal area, a matrix provides a more detailed description of specific issues and opportunities. The opportunities identified are not recommendations but are instead intended to aid the project team and Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) in policy development. Using this document as a resource, the project team and PAC may decide to explore some of the issues discussed in this report as part of the statewide Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan process; while other issues may be addressed through different channels as the opportunities arise.



2.0 – Issues and Opportunities by Goal Area

Safety is identified as a central goal of the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. The safe accommodation of bicyclists and pedestrians is a primary goal of most state plans and policies and is included as a high priority in most regional and local plans and policies. Specific examples of how safety is addressed include: the promotion of safe bicycling behavior education programs, the use of safety as a factor to guide investment, and the consideration of bicyclist and pedestrian safety in road maintenance functions. However, there are some concerns about the type and use of safety data - in particular the consistency of pedestrian and bicyclist crash reporting as well as the limited or inconsistent use of this data in prioritization.

There are opportunities for this Plan to build off of the findings and recommendations of the recently completed *ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Implementation Plan*.

Safety	
Issue	Opportunity
Safety is a primary goal of most local, regional, and state plans in Oregon but is not always used to prioritize bicycle and pedestrian improvements.	Identify barriers to the use of safety in prioritization processes. These could include issues with data collection, availability, and reliability, among others.
	Develop guidelines for a basic prioritization process that can help guide counties and cities without established prioritization processes.
	Consider incorporating recommendations into the Plan to use safety to prioritize bicycle and pedestrian improvements
	Improve data collection through the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Implementation Plan.
Bicycle and pedestrian crash data reporting is inconsistent.	Working with other agencies, consider developing standardized, recommended best practices for the collection and reporting of pedestrian and bicycle crash data. Encourage coordination between data collectors, EMS, hospital, and police.
	Support the availability of crash data. Consider modifying the TransGIS database and mapping application to specify bike or ped involved crash data.



	Take advantage of existing and emerging technology to capture crash data, such as utilizing electronic crash (eCrash) data collection systems.
	Develop policy recommendations for changes in data collection methods and standardized reporting that support the ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Implementation Plan recommendations.
	Develop policy recommendations on how to use the findings of the ODOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Implementation Plan with regard to key factors commonly resulting in crashes to prioritize bicycle and pedestrian improvements.
<p>Safety within school zones is emphasized as a priority in many state, regional, and local plans. However, the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program faces several challenges. It is still an eligible use of federal funds but is now an optional program, which Oregon has elected to continue. Funding for education and outreach and engineering projects no longer have a dedicated funding source and now compete directly with all projects in the “Enhance” STIP allocation process.</p>	Use a data driven approach to evaluate the effectiveness of the SRTS program in terms of providing safe access and increased active transportation mode share for vulnerable road users. While this is sometimes done at the local level on an ad hoc basis, a state program may be beneficial. Evaluate whether a state facilitated data program to monitor and evaluate success of SRTS would be advantageous.
	Explore opportunities to redefine the Oregon SRTS program to specifically address Oregon’s needs and values. Opportunities may include expanding guidance, programming, and partnerships.
	Evaluate the commitment (financial and otherwise) that would be required to establish a SRTS program at every elementary and middle schools in Oregon.
	Seek opportunities to partner with other agencies in future SRTS program design, funding and implementation.
	Evaluate opportunities to establish stable sources of funding for SRTS education and outreach.
<p>Education and outreach to transportation professionals, law enforcement professionals and the public could be improved.</p>	Identify strategies to increase enforcement by working with state and local police. Identify best practices for building partnerships with enforcement agencies.
	Consider developing a strategy to promote the availability and understanding of the value of crash data and its analysis to a wider audience such as: other ODOT staff, MPOs/ACTs, cities, counties, advocates, and law enforcement. Promote the use



	of the T2 Circuit Rider for Safety Analysis.
	Gaps in knowledge include rules of the road (specifically regarding the vehicle code and how it applies to different road users). Ensure that proper guidance is developed and easily accessible for all road users.
	Ensure that bicycling is promoted as a viable and accepted transportation choice for all people, including disadvantaged populations. Work to understand cultural biases against bicycling and walking in minority communities. Develop and promote resources to encourage safe bicycling habits.
Identify and address legislative barriers to bicycling in Oregon.	Evaluate the legislative language and definitions (i.e., motor vehicle code) in order to address better coordination opportunities between various users of roadway.
	Evaluate how statutes and rules that restrict some bicycle or pedestrian movement may be a barrier to biking or walking.
TAC Comment: Much of the data currently collected is driven by requirements from FHWA or by law. New legislation may be needed to gain the detail needed to better understand the safety issues.	
TAC Comment: Many bicycle injuries do not involve auto related crashes.	Work to prevent bicyclists' injuries caused by design related issues.
TAC Comment: Local TSPs could benefit from incorporating elements of ODOT's Safety Action Plan.	Provide guidance to local jurisdictions to incorporate elements of ODOT's Safety Action Plan in Transportation System Plan updates.



Mobility and Efficiency are comprehensively addressed in statewide plans, which focus on promoting programs and facilities that improve transportation choices for residents and visitors in Oregon. Most local and regional plans refer to the mobility or efficiency benefits that bicycle and pedestrian facilities can bring to communities. However, two key issue areas were identified. First, there is the opportunity to expand state and local policy support for improved connections between transit and bicycle/pedestrian networks. In addition, there is some concern that state-level policies regarding freight transportation may create hesitancy at the local level around planning bicycle and pedestrian improvements on some freight routes.

Mobility and Efficiency	
Issue	Opportunity
Several communities mentioned the practice or possibility of leveraging transit funds to assist with bicycle and pedestrian planning; this may be especially useful for providing connectivity to transit (first and last mile trips).	Explore new or different funding opportunities for improving connections between transit and active transportation. The challenge is that existing transit funding goes towards existing transit service and operations.
	Consider ways to prioritize improved connections between active transportation and transit during construction projects.
	Explore opportunities to realize mutually beneficial outcomes for transit and active transportation, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop guidance and best practices to encourage coordination. • Work with other agencies and programs to promote this coordination. • Work to integrate planning between transit and bicycle and pedestrian planning. • Include greater consideration for the connection between active transportation and transit with future updates of bicycle and pedestrian design guidance documents.
Freight and bicycles are often interpreted as non-compatible modes.	Consider opportunities for continued coordination for bicycle/pedestrian projects when ORS 366.215 applies.
	Identify possible context sensitive treatments that both accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians and maintain appropriate freight carrying



	capacity. Where possible, promote opportunities for separation that doesn't constrain the mobility of either mode.
Driveway locations and pedestrian uses can be seen as a conflict of uses, which can impede mobility for a variety of users.	Examine opportunities for coordination on context sensitive treatments that accommodate pedestrian uses while still addressing the needs of property owners and business.
TAC Comment: Electric scooters and other mobility devices are not currently well addressed.	
TAC Comment: Skateboards, roller-skates and other wheeled, non-motorized users are not well addressed.	



Accessibility and Connectivity are typically addressed in local and regional plans, which often use a coordinated approach to land use and transportation planning that can be supportive of walking and bicycling. State transportation plans also recognize locations where accessibility for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit-users should be prioritized. One of the issue areas identified relates to inconsistencies in how Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements are handled. Although plans and policies often acknowledge ADA requirements, there is a lack of emphasis on implementing policies and projects to support these needs. Another issue area relates to gaps in the sidewalk network, one reason for which are local policies requiring developers to build sidewalks along their property frontage, but no provision to fill in gaps between properties.

Accessibility and Connectivity	
Issue	Opportunity
Accessibility, including discontinuous and ADA deficient sidewalks are often discussed, however there is a lack of consistency in policy response.	Consider adding ADA compliance as a requirement, performance metric, or consideration in project prioritization. (Note: ADA compliance is already a requirement for use of Federal funds through FHWA)
	ADA compliance should be incorporated and scoped as part of every project.
Some communities lack institutionalized mechanisms to identify opportunities, and address gaps and/or to expand their bicycle and/or pedestrian networks.	Consider developing Complete Streets or routine accommodation plans and policies.
	Consider developing a report or case studies that highlights the impact of local Complete Streets and routine accommodation policies on mode split, bicycle-friendly community designations, miles of active transportation infrastructure, economic impacts or other measures.
	Promote policies or processes for creating “institutional check-points” for consideration and inclusion of pedestrian and bicycling improvements in routine maintenance, redesign, and reconstruction projects.
Network connectivity (particularly sidewalk gaps) is an issue in some communities.	Explore possibilities for establishing a funding source for strategic sidewalk infill projects. Considerations include exploring more flexible use of development fees towards active transportation improvements, dedicating a portion of other revenues (For example the City of Roseburg



	dedicates a third of their hotel/motel tax to sidewalk, light, and signal construction and improvement), and other concepts.
	Consider statewide guidance on developer sidewalk provisions. Explore concepts such as in-lieu fees, off-site improvement requirements, first-in policies and pay-back systems.
The relationship between buildings, streets, sidewalks, and transit facilities as well as a linked series of spaces, visual landmarks, and available routes impact how easy and attractive it is to access transit.	Support land use policies and practices which promote direct, attractive connections without barriers or dead ends.
Consider Right of Way (ROW) issues. (<i>Identified through survey</i>)	Research ROW issues as barriers and opportunities in providing bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
There is a need to address the “seamlessness” of the system as facilities cross jurisdictional boundaries. (<i>Identified through survey</i>)	Investigate ways to improve policy and funding support for bicycle safety and connections on State Highways as they cross jurisdictional boundaries (for example as you go from a city into a county).
TAC Comment: Railroad tracks and lack of crossing opportunities present a barrier to connectivity.	



A correlation between **Community and Economic Vitality** and investment in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is identified in a number of state plans and policies including the Oregon Transportation Plan. A number of key partnerships have also been established to promote bicycle tourism such as the Bike Friendly Business Program, and the Oregon Scenic Bikeways. Several local and regional plans recognize the potential impact of bicycle and pedestrian friendly environments in attracting skilled labor, businesses, and visitors, but few plans identified policies promoting bicycle and pedestrian-related community and economic development. While tourism programs are increasingly being developed, the plans reviewed for this effort gave minimal consideration to facilitating bicycle and pedestrian-friendly development.

Community and Economic Vitality	
Issue	Opportunity
Key partnerships have been established to promote tourism with statewide agencies and organizations including the Ride Oregon Ride Program (Travel Oregon) and Oregon Scenic Bikeways (Oregon Parks and Recreation); however, there are opportunities to do more of this on the local level.	Continue to promote existing programs. Explore opportunities to coordinate with other potential partner communities and organizations (such as the example in Gresham where the City partnered with the Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce) that have interest or have implemented bicycle tourism initiatives
Policies aimed at attracting tourism and new business tend to be included in recently updated plans, suggesting it is an emerging topic that other communities may be considering. However, there is little guidance available.	Promote best practices from local communities that are incorporating tourism and economic development related to bicycling and walking. Create example language and policies that can be used as a template for local and regional planning agencies.
While multiple programs exist to promote tourism, there is limited guidance on how to encourage bicycle and pedestrian friendly development through responsible land use and transportation policies. Challenges that fall under this umbrella include bicycle parking and sidewalk development requirements.	Identify and document best practices for bicycle and pedestrian friendly development and make these available as a guide to developers and review agencies.
Programs which promote healthy downtowns, such as Main Street Programs, may not explicitly recognize and promote the correlation between the pedestrian environment and economic and community vitality.	Ensure that such programs are promoted as addressing both economic and community vitality. Ensure that communities are aware of any resources available to support them.
Well-connected and maintained sidewalks contribute to community vitality.	



Equity was not consistently addressed in the local, regional, and state plans and policies reviewed. Compliance with ADA requirements is an equity issue that is commonly addressed, but other issues such as geographic or socio-economic equity are not regularly addressed in plans and policies. There were some examples in (mostly urban) communities where local plans included policy recommendations or prioritization methods that included equity (both ADA and social equity) considerations.

Equity	
Issue	Opportunity
Bicycle and pedestrian guidance often focuses on urban or suburban contexts, with more limited guidance available for the rural context.	Continue to update and provide context sensitive guidance on improving pedestrian and bicycle conditions in rural, suburban, and urban contexts. Recognize that different design considerations are needed in each context.
	Ensure that local and regional agencies are aware of and have access to context sensitive guidance resources.
Biking and walking is especially important to disadvantaged populations. Socio-economic equity is not considered consistently in the prioritization of investments.	Encourage or promote the use of socio-economic equity as criteria for active transportation investments.
	Develop guidance on the use of socio-economic equity in prioritization efforts. Utilize existing data sources and information, and coordinate strategies with local and regional agencies.
	Identify barriers (in addition to infrastructure) to walking and biking for disadvantaged people.
For some low income individuals, active transportation modes such as biking, walking and access to transit are primary means of transportation by necessity.	
TAC Comment: low income housing may lack access to non-auto modes, realize higher levels of noise and air pollution and have higher accident rates for people who walk where there are no sidewalks.	
TAC Comment:	Explore interactive outreach tools to increase engagement.



Health is often listed as a reason for investing in pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure in state, regional, and local plans, but it is rarely integrated into plan policies or performance measures. Integrating consideration of health impacts and outcomes into the planning process can facilitate this conversation; however, this link is not often well developed in transportation plans.

Health	
Issue	Opportunity
While health is routinely included in state, regional and local plan visions and goals, few performance measures and strategies have been developed which articulate a correlation between active transportation and health.	Building off the Memorandum of Understanding between ODOT and the Public Health Division of the Oregon Health Authority, continue to explore the opportunities related to the correlation between active transportation and health utilizing tools such as health impact assessments of active transportation plans and projects.
	Consider incorporating the findings and recommendations from health studies into state plans and policies. Work with local and regional agencies to do the same.
	Explore opportunities to leverage funding programs for advancing both health and transportation goals.
	Support the exploration of how mental health and social sustainability could be better integrated into active transportation plans and health impact assessments.
	Evaluate ways to communicate the connection between active transportation and community health benefits.
A health lens could be better engaged to encourage solutions that achieve both health and transportation goals.	Encourage the active engagement and inclusion of health professionals in transportation planning, such as through engagement between ACTs MPOs and local health policy professionals.
	When appropriate, support the use of HIAs to evaluate bicycling and walking projects.
TAC Comment:	“Walk score” can be used to assess and validate pedestrian level of comfort.



Sustainability is regularly addressed in state, regional and local plans and policies. Three areas of emphasis are often applied – financial, environmental, and/or social sustainability. Financial sustainability is commonly addressed in state plans and in some local and regional plans, and is addressed in this report in the Strategic Investment goal section. Social sustainability considerations are addressed in the Equity and Community and Economic Vitality section. Environmental sustainability is addressed throughout the majority of the local, regional and state plans that were reviewed, most of which provide strong policy support for environmental sustainability across ODOT Regions and in all geographic contexts. Many plans also include performance measures related to air quality or emissions reductions targets.

Sustainability	
Issue	Opportunity
<p>Many state plans list sustainability as a major plan goal or describe the environmental benefits of pedestrian and bicycle improvements. However, many plans do not include specific policy support, prioritization methods or performance measures related to sustainability.</p>	<p>Promote the use of emissions reduction performance measures in local and regional plans and polices. Share institutional knowledge that has been gained in the active management of such state performance measures.</p>
	<p>Consider how bike and pedestrian facilities should be considered as part of sustainability efforts at the project level, such as the coordination between stormwater management and sidewalks.</p>
	<p>Many local plans do not identify sustainability performance measures. Encourage the inclusion of performance measures that measure GHG emissions, such as those in the Statewide Transportation Strategy (STS). Share performance measure data that ODOT is currently collecting with local and regional governments to reduce barriers to implementation.</p>
<p>State key performance measures, especially those that track bicycle and pedestrian progress, are lacking.</p>	<p>Explore additional options for tracking the progress of bicycling and walking in Oregon such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mode shift. • Bicycle and pedestrian injury and fatality- call out the most vulnerable road users in their own performance measure. • Percent of (non-urban) state highway system that provides paved shoulders or bike lanes.
<p>TAC Comment: The design of bicycle and pedestrian facilities should be sensitive to the context of the adjacent natural and built environments.</p>	



Strategic Investment in pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure points to a need for reliable funding sources, defined project prioritization processes and adequate maintenance programs. Funding was reviewed in the Existing Conditions review, which included a summary of funding sources currently used for active transportation in Oregon. With limited federal and state funding available, communities are increasingly relying on local or regional funds, such as property taxes or vehicle registration fees, to implement active transportation projects. Nevertheless, federal and state funding remains important and it is critical that communities, particularly smaller communities, are aware of what funding opportunities are available.

Defined project prioritization processes exist in some communities but are not the standard. Maintenance of bicycle and pedestrian facilities is also not consistently addressed in local and regional plans, and there are anecdotal concerns that maintenance budgets are insufficient. It is important not only that maintenance budgets are adequate but also that they are increased over time to keep up with expanding pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.

Strategic Investment	
Issue	Opportunity
The approaches used to prioritize active transportation facility improvements vary greatly. Some are quantitative and data-driven, while others are more subjective or informal.	Explore, develop and provide a recommended methodology for prioritizing active transportation facility improvements. The approaches used in Washington County and Portland are good examples of data-driven prioritization. Prioritization methods could be enhanced to include a gap analysis and an evaluation of both equity, and safety variables, among others.
Federal support for active transportation projects has declined and communities are not always aware of the options for raising local funds.	Clarify state enabling legislation that allows communities to raise funds for active transportation. Consider developing guidance that clearly articulates what options local and regional agencies have for raising funds for bicycle and pedestrian projects.
Revenues from state and local gas taxes are in decline. Gas taxes serve as a major source of funding for roadway improvements for the state. Increased vehicle fuel efficiency and tax rates that have not kept pace with inflation have resulted in declining revenue streams.	Continue to support exploration to alternatives to the gas tax, such the Road User Charge pilot program.



<p>Maintaining bicycle and pedestrian facilities through sweeping and routine maintenance is often emphasized as a strategy to attract new, as well as retain current, bicyclists and pedestrians but is not always implemented.</p>	<p>Work with local and regional jurisdictions to identify means for providing routine maintenance (e.g. sweeping scenic bikeways, non-ADA compliant sidewalks) to commonly traveled bike and pedestrian routes.</p>
<p>The Oregon Bike Bill (ORS 366.514) sets a minimum of 1% of state gas tax revenues aside for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The State and local jurisdictions may choose to use more than 1% towards these projects and may also save up funds for larger or more comprehensive projects. Few communities have adopted policies to require more than 1% of their share of state gas tax revenues be set aside for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Communities that do have such policies, usually do so informally. In many communities this money is the main source of bicycle and pedestrian funding and is set aside for grant match requirements.</p>	<p>Explore opportunities for other dedicated funding sources for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.</p>
<p>There is a need to identify and prioritize critical connections. For example identify barriers for pedestrian access between residential and commercial areas, schools, transit stops and other important destinations.</p>	<p>Explore the need to study this issue and provide guidance or criteria to help prioritize addressing critical connections</p>
<p>Transportation System Plans (TSPs) guidance could better address best practices for achieving higher bike/ped mode split. <i>(Identified through survey)</i></p>	<p>Provide guidance on best practices in TSPs to achieve high mode split. Research if there is a correlation between a local strategy to prioritize filling in the gaps (missing links, safety barriers, etc.) first in order to create a connected route and a connected system.</p>
<p>There is a lack of knowledge of existing options to address sidewalk infill and repair. <i>(Identified through survey)</i></p>	<p>Develop and provide guidance on best practices for funding sidewalk infill and repair.</p>



Local jurisdictions feel they lack adequate resources for data gathering and analysis. <i>(Identified through survey)</i>	Consider ways to provide new or prioritize existing funds for improved data gathering and analysis.
Transportation funding lags behind identified need. <i>(Identified through survey)</i>	Provide policy support to seek/create additional funding mechanisms for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.
TAC Comment:	Consider funding or encouraging funding of projects that involve more than 1 of the 5 E's for more impact and collaboration.



Coordination, Cooperation, and Collaboration with neighboring municipalities is recognized in many local and regional plans as a key to providing comprehensive bicycle facilities that are connected and easy to navigate across boundaries. Ownership of and responsibility for pedestrian facilities is also an issue requiring inter-jurisdictional coordination. Urban and suburban plans tend to have a greater focus on providing regional facilities such as shared-use paths that cross jurisdictional boundaries. There are opportunities to improve partnerships with universities, colleges, employers, and community groups that have developed active transportation plans and programs. There are some limitations and inconsistencies with the type and availability of data and the way it is shared between state and local agencies.

Coordination, Cooperation, and Collaboration	
Issue	Opportunity
Urban and suburban plans tend to have a greater focus on providing regional facilities such as shared-use paths that cross jurisdictional boundaries. There is less of a focus on ensuring that quality regional connections are provided in rural areas.	Emphasize the value of on-street rural connections to transportation funding decision makers, especially at the local level.
	Evaluate the process of funding and developing rural trails and routes. Ensure that adequate support and time, in order to allow regional coordination, are given to these communities during the grants application process.
	Identify best practices and provide guidance for establishing a grants process that is supportive of collaborative projects. Consider developing potential guidance with partners who influence grants processes, such as the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department.
	Ensure that potential regional impacts are a consideration in selecting projects, including providing regional connections in rural areas. Consider developing funding evaluation criteria for such projects.
	Explore opportunities to establish a stable funding source for regional trails and routes.
Oregon bicycle and pedestrian related data and resources are not easily accessible online. Different types of data are stored in multiple	Explore possibilities for creating a centralized database of commonly utilized bicycle and pedestrian data.



locations, across multiple jurisdictions.	Consider creating an online repository of resources, including state resources and example plans, policies, and programs from willing local and regional partners.
	Develop an online mapping tool and database to show and download crash and other active transportation data.
Some universities, colleges, employers, agencies, and community groups have developed unique active transportation plans, initiatives, programs, and infrastructure (for example the Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce's East Multnomah Bicycle Tourism Initiative).	Facilitate statewide partnerships with these groups and local and regional authorities in order to improve active transportation planning and data collection through a bottom up approach.
Data collection, sharing and use could be improved. <i>(Identified through survey)</i>	Where appropriate, consider ways to improve bicycle count information on ODOT managed facilities.
	Consider ways to improve access to bicycle count equipment for local jurisdictions. Research the viability of ODOT owning equipment which can be borrowed by jurisdictions for counts on local facilities.
	Develop and provide guidance documents on data collection methodologies and data standards.
	Develop and provide guidance documents on using available state and federal data.
	Develop and provide guidance documents on using a data driven methodology.
	Develop and provide technical support and training on collecting, analyzing and using data (new or existing sources).
TAC Comment: the regional aspect of bike projects was hard to access during the Connect Oregon review process.	



<p>TAC comment: Railroad companies are perceived as difficult to engage in conversations about crossings and right of way issues.</p>	
---	--



APPENDIX A: REVIEWED PLANS

The following types of documents were reviewed as a part of the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Existing Conditions Memo:

- TSP
- MPO
- Local
- Local Other (miscellaneous)
- State

The Existing Conditions Memo is part of a larger series of background reports that will help the project team identify and understand gaps, issues, and opportunities in Oregon active transportation. The reports focus on three areas, including:

- Plans, projects, and programs.
- Funding processes, policies, and sources.
- Bicycle and walking data sources.

The evaluation of these areas of active transportation planning assess the degree to which they (as individual documents, and as a statewide system as a whole) support, conflict with, or are silent with respect to the draft Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan vision and goals. This will help identify existing gaps, issues, and opportunities in pedestrian and bicycle planning and develop recommendations that realize the Plan's vision and goals.



Table 1: State Resources Reviewed

Plan	Year of Adoption
Transportation Options Plan	2015 (forthcoming)
Oregon Rail Plan	2014 (forthcoming)
Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Implementation Plan	2014
Statewide Transportation Strategy	2013 (endorsed)
ODOT Sustainability Plan Vol. 1	2011
Oregon ADA Transition Plan	2011
Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guide	2011
Oregon Freight Plan	2011
Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan	2011
Oregon Transportation Plan	2006
Oregon Highway Plan	1999
Oregon Public Transportation Plan	1997
Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan	1995
Oregon Safe Routes to School Program	Ongoing

Table 2: Sample Regional Transportation Plans

MPO Plan	Region	Year of Adoption
Metro Active Transportation Plan	1	2014
Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan	1	2012
CAMPO Area Regional Transportation Plan	2	2012
Mid-Willamette Regional Transportation Plan	2	2011
Central Lane Regional Transportation Plan	2	2011
RVMPO Regional Transportation Plan (Rogue Valley)	3	2013
Bend MPO Metropolitan Transportation Plan	4	2007



Table 3: TSPs Reviewed

Community	Region	Year of Adoption	Population Density (Persons per Mi ²)
Milwaukie	1	2011	4,209.8
Hood River	1	2007	2,810.6
Polk County	2	2009	102.0
Springfield	2	2014	3,774.0
Toledo	2	2013	1,589.4
Ashland	3	2012	3,046.7
Coos County	3	2011	39.0
Myrtle Creek	3	2006	1,370.1
Crook County	4	2011	7.0
Klamath Falls	4	2012	1,050.0
Baker City	5	2013	1,372.6
Morrow County	5	2005	5.0
Clackamas County	1	2014 ¹	201.0

Table 4: Local Active Transportation Plans Reviewed

Community	Region	Year of Adoption	Population Density (Persons per Mi ²)
Portland (Bicycle)	1	2013	4,375.1
Portland (Pedestrian)	1	1998	4,375.1
Washington County	1	2010	732.0
Wilsonville	1	2006	2,705.8
Eugene	2	2012 (accepted)	3,572.4
Roseburg	3	2009	2,116.0
Lincoln City	3	2014	1,403.5

¹ Clackamas County adopted a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan in 2003, and is currently developing an Active Transportation Plan. The newly adopted 2014 TSP was reviewed in order to gain a more current understanding of bicycle and pedestrian planning in Clackamas County.



Table 5: Other Local Plans and Resources Reviewed

Community	Region	Year of Adoption	Population Density (Persons per Mi ²)
Hillsboro ADA Transition Plan	1	2012	3,833.1
East Multnomah County Bicycle Tourism Initiative	1	2014	1,690.0 (Multnomah County)
Portland Bike Count Report	1	2012	4,375.1
Trimet Pedestrian Network Analysis Report	1	2011	
Trimet Transit Investment Plan	1	2012	
Washington County Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Design Health Impact Assessment	1	2012	732.0
Washington County Bicycle and Pedestrian Prioritization Project	1	2012	732.0
Eugene ADA Transition Plan	2	2008	3,572.4
Salem Pedestrian and Bike Safe Routes to School Evaluation	2	2011	3,228.3
Bend Bicycle and Pedestrian Documentation Project	4	2013	2,321.7
Rapid Health Impact Assessment of Crook County/Prineville Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety	4	2011	8.0 (Crook County), 847.3 (Prineville)
City of Madras: Creating Safe Routes to School	4	2009	1204.4
Baker County Transportation Standards	5		5.0



APPENDIX B: INTERVIEWED COMMUNITIES

Several communities were interviewed in order to refine issues and opportunities developed in this report. The communities interviewed, topics discussed, and associated Plan goals are listed in **Table 1**.

Community	Topics	Associated Goals
City of Portland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritization • Social equity • Funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety • Equity • Investment • Sustainability
Washington County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forthcoming TSP • Prioritization • Funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety • Equity • Investment
Gresham Area Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination with partners • Tourism • Bicycle-pedestrian friendly development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic and Community Vitality • Investment • Coordination
City of Roseburg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritization • Funding • Maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investment • Accessibility • Connectivity
Crook County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nexus of health and active transportation • Geographic equity • Coordination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health • Equity • Coordination

Table 1: Local and Regional Agencies Interviewed