

Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Policy Advisory Committee Meeting #8 Summary

Tuesday, March 18, 2015 1:00–4:00 p.m.

Location: Keizer Civic Center, 930 Chemawa Road NE, Salem

Committee Members Present

Tammy Baney (Chair), *Oregon Transportation Commission*

Steve Dickey, *Salem-Keizer Transit District*

Peter Fernandez, *City of Salem*

Bob Joondeph, *Disability Rights Oregon*

Gerik Kransky, *Bicycle Transportation Alliance*

Mark Labhart, *Tillamook County Commission*

Sid Leiken, *Lane County Commission*

Jerry Norquist, *Cycle Oregon*

Susan Peithman, *OBPAC* (alternate for Jenna Stanke Marmon)

Phil Warnock, *Cascades West COG*

Committee Members Absent

Jerry Breazeale, *Rural Oregon representative*

Craig Campbell, *AAA Oregon/Idaho*

Chris DiStefano, *Rapha*

Noel Mickelberry, *Oregon Walks*

Bob Russell, *Oregon Trucking Associations*

Sally Russell*, *Bend City Council*

Dan Thorndike, *Medford Fabrication*

ODOT Staff Present

Savannah Crawford, *Principal Planner*

Stephanie Millar, *Senior Planner*

Amanda Pietz, *Transportation Planning Unit Manager*

Talia Jacobson, *ODOT Active Transportation Policy Lead*

Jerri Bohard, *Transportation Development Division Administrator*

Sheila Lyons, *Bike/Ped Program Manager*

Mac Lynde, *Active Transportation Section Manager*

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

Nick Forte, *Federal Highway Administration*

*Has submitted her resignation due to conflicts

Key Meeting Outcomes

The PAC:

- Reviewed changes to and provided input on the draft policies and strategies.
- Received an introduction to key initiatives that will inform the Implementation Considerations chapter of the Plan.

The following are some of the key outcomes of the discussion:

- The PAC provided consensus-based feedback on the revised policies and strategies. With this input, the policies and strategies will be generally complete, allowing for the potential for some refinements. The team and committee will now focus their work on other sections of the Plan.
- The next PAC meeting is scheduled for April 7, though this may change due to scheduling conflicts. The group will continue the conversation around Key Initiatives, introduce the topic of Performance Measures and bring back the revised Policies and Strategies.

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Commissioner Tammy Baney, PAC Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked the group for their attendance. She said the group would be revisiting the policy discussion today and would receive an introduction to the key initiatives that will influence implementation.

Jeanne Lawson, JLA Public Involvement, reviewed the agenda. She reiterated that the committee will primarily focus on reviewing the revised policies and strategies. She said that the focus will be on changes resulting from PAC and TAC feedback and the topics flagged for further discussion at the last meeting, including equity and strategic investment. She noted this meeting marks a milestone because it marks general completion of the PAC's work on the policies and beginning work on the Key Initiatives from the Implementations Considerations chapter of the Plan if time allowed.

Jeanne introduced Susan Peithman, Vice-Chair of the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee (OBPAC), who was sitting in for Jenna Stanke Marmon. Members of the committee, project team and audience introduced themselves.

Approval of 2-2-15 Meeting Summary

There were no comments on the meeting summary.

PAC Member Report Outs

PAC members reported on who they had spoken with about the Plan since the last meeting and any issues and concerns the group should be aware of. Members described participation at the National Bike Summit and the National Association of Counties conference. A committee member said he had provided updates to the Lane ACT and MPC and said that they showed support for the work being done. He also discussed a recent crash in Springfield involving a car and four pedestrians and described a visit to the River Walk in San Antonio as a good

example of pedestrian-friendly development. The group discussed transportation funding that was recently stalled in the state legislature.

Savannah Crawford, Jerri Bohard and Jenna Stanke Marmon recently provided an update to the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee. The meeting provided good cross-linkage between the OBPAC and the OFAC.

Savannah said that ODOT will have a prominent display at the upcoming Oregon Active Transportation Summit and asked committee members to spread the word.

Amanda Pietz said ODOT will soon be doing another round of public outreach for the plan, including presenting to the ACTs. She said the project team would love committee members to co-present with them and would also like to hear about other presentation opportunities.

Policy Development Update

Savannah Crawford provided an update on the planning process. She said the PAC would wrap up their major discussion of the Policies and Strategies chapter today and would begin discussion on the Implementation Considerations Chapter. She said the project team would soon begin working on the Introduction; Trends, Challenges and Opportunities; and Investment Considerations chapters and would bring content to the PAC as it is developed. She noted that much of the input received from the TAC has had to do with implementation, so it would come into consideration in coming PAC meetings. Savannah provided an example the life cycle of a strategy, showing potential pathways to implementation and how that might be reflected in the implementation component of the plan and the Implementation plan that will follow adoption.

Revised Policies and Strategies

Peter Lagerwey, Consultant Project Manager, provided an overview of the policy revisions since the last meeting. He said the project team tried to balance the tone of the strategies to be substantive without being too prescriptive; to incorporate collaborative language; to use stronger action words; and to be sensitive to the needs of urban versus rural areas. He also said that quite a few language tweaks were done to clarify meaning. Peter noted that data-related policies have been removed and that data would be addressed in a separate place in the document. He said that the last PAC meeting identified several topics needing more discussion, including equity and strategic investment.

Savannah said the project team had met with the TAC last month to review the policies and strategies. She said that some of their questions and comments had been provided to the PAC in a handout for further consideration. She reviewed the key changes or questions for each goal area and asked the committee for their input.

Note: Group recommendations or areas where the committee indicated general support are bolded.

Goal 1: Safety

- Goal language made more concise.
- Strategy 1.1D: The TAC had questioned whether visibility and decreased crossing distance were really related or whether they should be addressed in two separate policies.
 - **The PAC supported separating this into two strategies, as long as both the concepts of visibility and crossing distances were kept.**

- 1.1H: New strategy specifically addressing safety in relation to driveways.
 - The PAC had a discussion about sidewalk/driveway treatments and ADA requirements. Several members had concerns about the policy being too directive, being duplicative of existing requirements or overlapping with local government design standards.
 - One PAC member suggested removing “reducing driveway aprons” from the end of the strategy. Several members expressed support for this.
 - PAC members also suggested language such as “consider driveways and sidewalk dips” and adding “when possible.”
 - The project team noted that ADA has a variety of acceptable designs and the intention of this strategy is to help define best practice and address the comfort and safety issue of undulating driveways.
 - An ODOT staff member noted that ODOT already has bike/ped guidelines that suggest alternative sidewalk designs.
 - The project team noted that the exact wording does not need to be confirmed at the current meeting; **the wording will be revised based on PAC feedback. It will define the desired outcome and be worded as a performance outcome. The committee indicated general support for this approach.**
- Strategy 1.4C: New strategy regarding enforcement.
 - **The committee indicated general support of the new strategy.**
- TAC suggestion for new strategy:
 - Savannah said the TAC had suggested a new strategy regarding making it a legal requirement to install bicycle detection at all new and replaced signals. There are similar laws in Washington and California. She noted that typically a legal issue such as this wouldn’t be included as a policy, but is something to look into during the planning process.
 - A committee member suggested that the Traffic Control Device Committee should weigh in on this issue.
 - Peter Lagerwey noted that Strategy 1.1A has to do with updating design guidelines, so any design-related comments may be addressed by this strategy.
 - **A committee member thought that covering this issue in 1.1A is fine, although 1.1A should call out signals more specifically to make sure this issue is addressed. The committee showed general agreement with this suggestion.**
 - Nick Forte, of the Federal Highways Administration, suggested that implementation of the design guidelines is a further step to consider including.
- Policy 1.2
 - Savannah said that the TAC had suggested adding a strategy about incorporating education and outreach materials and enforcement into projects that utilize new and innovative bicycle and pedestrian treatments to educate all road users in order to promote proper use and understanding. This would be similar to 1.2D but would focus on education of users on how to use the system rather than education on operation of devices.
 - **It was suggested these two ideas be combined under the one strategy, under the umbrella of innovation.**
 - A committee member said that this policy is missing a strategy specific to motorists.
 - Amanda Pietz noted that the Transportation Safety Action Plan (TSAP) specifically includes policies related to education for all road users, including motorists. However, a

policy specifically regarding education for motorists around bike/ped treatments would be appropriate in the Bike/Ped plan.

- Savannah Crawford noted that Strategy 1.2A is intended to identify and target various audiences. She said the project team would work on making this strategy more clear.
- A committee member asked how the linkages between the Bike/Ped and TSAP plans will be addressed.
 - Amanda Pietz said that the TSAP is in the initial stages of development so the Bike/Ped plan will not be able to cross-reference it, however ODOT's goal is to make sure the two plans are consistent and there aren't any gaps. She said the TSAP is likely to address bicycle and pedestrian safety, however the Bike/Ped plan will go deeper. She said she would prefer to err on the side of putting more into the Bike/Ped plan to avoid the risk of having gaps later on.
 - A committee member expressed concern about the complications of having various plans related to the same topics. Amanda noted that ODOT is working to address this by creating a document that would show the full gamut of policies across all plans, however it doesn't yet exist.
 - Jerri Bohard noted that the TSAP committee includes expertise from the enforcement and medical fields, while the Bike/Ped committee brings modal expertise. She said this will help the plans dovetail with one another.
 - Jeanne Lawson said that ODOT is currently in the process of creating a more integrated, multi-modal process and that it has never been done at this level before. She said the committee is in a good position to influence how the process happens and how the plans come together.
- A committee member said that, given the TSAP conversation, she would like to see motorist education addressed somewhere in the Bike/Ped policies, with instructions that the TSAP should drill down into the opportunities that exist for motorist education.
 - Jerri noted that the TSAP process has a website that can receive comments and that meetings are open for public comment.
 - **The group discussed adding a strategy regarding motorist education on the risks of various issues, such as speed, to bicyclists and pedestrians.**
- Strategy 1.1I
 - A committee member said the SPIS system already analyzes crashes involving bicyclists and pedestrians, so strengthening this data should not only track crashes via SPIS but also conditions or areas that are unsafe and not attracting pedestrians and cyclists. Amanda agreed, saying a goal is to gather more data by tracking near misses and other safety concerns through means other than SPIS. Jerri noted that a goal is to create a proactive data-driven system, whereas the SPIS is reactive.
 - The committee discussed the relevancy of Strategy 1.1I. **It was felt that Strategy 1.1I is relevant and should be kept, but an additional strategy regarding proactive data collection is needed.**
 - The project team will look into this and consider bringing back a data-related strategy that had previously been removed.
- Suggestion for new safety strategy

- A committee member said he would like to see an additional strategy regarding putting highway safety improvement funds toward construction projects that would improve safety for bikes and pedestrians.

Goal 2: Accessibility and Connectivity

- Policy 2.4
 - The intention is to be able to prioritize pathways with regional or statewide benefits. ODOT has begun testing these criteria on existing trails and have received feedback that the strategy is not clear enough to be functional in practice.
 - **The project team said they will rework this policy and bring back revisions. PAC members supported this.**
- Strategy 2.1D – New strategy to support a holistic approach to measuring bike/ped usage within the system
 - Amanda Pietz said there has been a lot of interest in this at the local level.
 - **The PAC supported including the new strategy.**
 - One committee member suggested the strategy should go further to define a multi-modal level of service (MMLOS) standard for transportation facilities.

Goal 3: Mobility and Efficiency

- Savannah noted that there were no major changes to this goal area; the PAC did not have any comments.

Goal 4: Community and Economic Vitality

- Policy 4.2
 - Savannah noted the language refinement within this goal. She said ODOT plans to run the language past Travel Oregon.
 - **The committee indicated general support for this approach.**
- Strategy 4.2C – New strategy clarifying the meaning of pedestrian tourism
 - A committee member was concerned about limiting pedestrian tourism to “within individual communities.” Amanda explained that they wanted to differentiate pedestrian tourism from hiking, but not necessarily limit to only within communities. **It was suggested that the word “individual” be removed to make this less specific.**
- Strategy 4.1B
 - **A committee member pointed out that school districts do not provide the facilities in the strategy. It was suggested to change “work with schools” to focus on other entities.**

Goal 5: Equity

- Talia Jacobson, ODOT Active Transportation Policy Lead, noted that equity was an area identified as needing further discussion at the last PAC meeting. She provided an overview and background of the key issues. She said that social equity is the focus of this goal; geographic equity has been moved elsewhere. She noted that meeting the requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act may not move as far forward as this plan wants to go. She talked about the people who experience transportation disadvantage and noted they are biking and walking less.
- Amanda Pietz said that ODOT feels it is important to address equity issues in the Transportation Options (TO) and Bike/Ped plans because they serve communities that have no other options for transportation. She asked whether the PAC feels the focus of this goal is correct.

- The PAC discussed the equity policies generally. Feedback included:
 - It feels fragmented to include equity in only the TO and Bike/Ped plans. The issue needs to be considered more broadly in the transportation system.
 - Disadvantaged communities should be identified and directly engaged.
 - Bike/ped should be a normal part of developing amenities for disadvantaged communities more broadly.
 - Bike/ped access to transit is a big issue.
 - Unlike other policies and strategies, the goal is not to increase usage but rather to address access and safety for the transportation disadvantaged communities – those who walk or bike by necessity.
 - Both rural and urban needs should be considered and addressed.
 - Need to know the state of transportation disadvantaged communities within the current system to identify need.
 - Several committee members gave examples of instances when equity policies would be useful and/or important, such as helping policy makers understand the necessity of dealing with the issue.
- **Overall, the committee agreed that equity strategies are important and relevant and should be included.**
- **It was suggested that the goal should include engagement with representatives of transportation disadvantaged communities.**
 - One committee member warned not to be too prescriptive, saying that local governments could determine specific outreach opportunities, noting that they knew best how to engage their communities.
 - Wording such as “build on local partnerships” was suggested.
 - A committee member suggested changing the wording in Strategy 5.2 to “community-driven prioritization” rather than “data-driven prioritization.”
- The project team said they would work on refining this goal area based on feedback.

The group took a break before continuing with the next goal areas. Savannah quickly reviewed changes to policies in the following goal areas and, due to time limitations, Jeanne asked the PAC members whether they were comfortable sending any suggestions or thoughts to the project team following the meeting in order to save discussion time for the Strategic Investment policies. The group agreed.

Goal 6: Health

- Savannah said that there were only minor changes to this goal area. Strategy 6.1F was added based on TAC and PAC feedback.
- One committee member said that the Lane ACT includes a public health official in its membership and this is very beneficial.

Goal 7: Sustainability

- Savannah said that strategies regarding financial sustainability had been moved into the Strategic Investment goal area and this section now focuses only on environmental sustainability.

Goal 9: Coordination, Cooperation and Collaboration

- Savannah said that the data-related strategies had been removed and would be combined in a separate section of the plan, rather than in the policy section. The language has been updated to better focus on collaboration and coordination.

The PAC noted that these changes were acceptable. Savannah then introduced changes to the final policy.

Goal 8: Strategic Investment

- Savannah noted that the goal language was updated based on PAC comments from last meeting.
 - **The committee indicated general support for the updated language.**
- Policy 8.2: Explanation box added to clarify the connection between maintenance and improvements and that one does not necessarily have to come before the other.
 - Jeanne noted that this change was in response to PAC feedback from the last meeting.
 - One committee member recommended making sure there was no conflict between the equity conversation and how to define the high-need locations.
 - The project team noted that there will always be some competition between goals and that policies are not solely project-related.
 - **The committee indicated general support for the update.**
- Strategy 8.2C: New strategy based on TAC feedback regarding being opportunistic in acquiring right-of-way and utilizing development projects.
 - **The committee indicated general support for the updated language.**
- Policy 8.1A
 - The group discussed how to convey that the intention is to supplement current funding, not replace it.
 - **It was suggested that wording be changed to “...exploration of funding alternatives in addition to the gas tax and Bike Bill...”**
 - Amanda also suggested adding a footnote to the Strategic Investment goal in regards to the Bike Bill.
- Policy 8.1B
 - Mac Lynde, Active Transportation Section Manager, pointed out that this policy is similar to 8.1A. He suggested that this be considered when ODOT wordsmiths the strategies.
 - **A committee member suggested adding something to indicate that the new, dedicated funding would be in addition to the current 1% funds.**
 - **A committee member suggested adding the idea of supporting local opportunities for funding.**
 - Amanda Pietz noted that the project team plans to identify the development of a local funding opportunities white paper under the implementation chapter.

Jeanne noted that, with conclusion of this discussion, the committee had sent the policies on to the next level of finalization and would move forward to focus on the next topic, which is implementation.

Implementation Considerations

Savannah Crawford discussed the outline of content that will be included in the Implementations Considerations chapter, focusing on the Key Initiatives portion. She said the Key Initiatives are foundational elements that are needed in order to implement the plan. The project team asked the TAC for their input, which resulted in four Key

Initiatives for PAC consideration: Defining a Network, Data, Training and Integration Planning, Program Level Performance Measure Development.

Jeanne Lawson noted that these key initiatives addressed some issues that were consistently and strongly raised by stakeholders but were less “policies” and more “calls to action.” Amanda Pietz added that the Key Initiatives acknowledge important work that needs to be done, but will not define how it should be done.

Discussion

- A committee member said that these Key Initiatives should be sure to include existing ODOT tools and optimizing them to achieve the needs of the Bike/Ped Plan.
 - Amanda said that evaluating existing tools would be part of the internal implementation plans, as well as identifying new tools.
- The project team noted that the TAC had a large discussion about Training and Integration Planning, including how to support small communities with limited resources around developing bike/ped issues.
 - A committee member said that engaging an outside consultant and subject matter expert was helpful in their downtown improvement plan and made the process more successful/implementable.
- A committee member asked where design guidelines fit in the implementation chapter.
 - The project team said that Defining a Network is key for developing design guidelines, but that they would also be considered in other parts of the implementation chapter.
- A committee member suggested including something around attracting funding and finding new funding sources.
- A committee member said that the Defining a Network measure isn't clear. The group discussed the intention of this measure, which is to help jurisdictions make choices. The project team said it is unclear because it could be achieved in many ways. It was agreed that the team will add clearer language.
- A committee member asked Peter and Jeanne for their opinions on whether the Key Initiatives are appropriate and complete.
 - Peter said that the common denominator in his experience between success in various communities are having good information and successful public involvement at the local level. He said that all the Key Initiatives are good, but that Training and Integration Planning is the most important piece.
 - Jeanne said that, based on initial interviews and processes, she feels that these initiatives hit the mark.

Public Comment

Savannah handed out a public comment received by email to the committee (attached at the end of this summary). She noted that the project team will check the facts in this and draft a reply that will be copied to the committee.

Wrap Up and Next Steps

The project team said the next meeting will consider implementation challenges and opportunities within the context of the larger plan. They will continue the conversation around Key Initiatives, introduce the topic of Performance Measures and bring back the revised Policies and Strategies.

The next meeting is scheduled for April 7, however it was noted that several PAC members have conflicts with and that the project team wants to make sure they have enough information to have the conversation. It is possible this meeting may be cancelled, delayed or held in a different format.

The meeting was adjourned.

DRAFT

From: Gary Shaff & Barbara Schack
Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2015 11:19 AM
To: CRAWFORD Savannah
Subject: Oregon Diversion

Hi Savannah,

Did you know that an auto driver can have a ticket removed from their driver's record by participating in Oregon's diversion course even though they injured or killed a pedestrian or cyclists? This doesn't seem right. Most other diversion programs, in other local jurisdictions and states (based upon my limited research), exclude citations that include an injury from being "diversion eligible." Doesn't it seem Oregon should do the same?

If I have overlooked something please let me know.

Thanks,
Gary Shaff

PS – Please pass this suggestion on to the Bike and Pedestrian Plan Committee and suggest that it be adopted as an OBP Policy.