

# ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP (CWG) MEETING #1

Subject: Active Transportation Community Working Group Meeting #1 Summary

Dates and Times: September 23, 2021, 4:30 to 7:00 P.M.

Location: Zoom Webinar and YouTube Livestream

## WELCOME REMARKS

Anita Yap, facilitator for the Active Transportation (AT) Community Working Group (CWG), welcomed everyone to the meeting at 4:35 and began by providing an overview of accessible participation options including closed captions and ASL interpretation. Anita then introduced Greg Johnson, IBR Program Administrator, who provided opening remarks. Anita led the team in an introductory exercise where each Community Working Group participant shared one word that summarized their hopes for the meeting's activity. The results of this word exercise were shared in a word cloud. Anita introduced two IBR staff presenters for the meeting, technical leads Derek Abe and Katie Mangle, as well as IBR program partners C-TRAN, TriMet, City of Vancouver, City of Portland, RTC, Metro, Port of Portland, and Port of Vancouver.

## OVERVIEW OF COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP AGREEMENTS, ROLES AND COMMITMENTS TO EQUITY

Anita Yap, Community Working Group Facilitator, then provided an overview of the CWG framework, and shared that two AT CWG participants, Ashton Simpson, and Robin Jay Richardson, are also Community Advisory Group (CAG) members who will provide direct linkage to the IBR CAG. This CWG will meet two times, with additional engagement opportunities throughout the process as needed. Feedback on specific transportation design concepts from these meetings will be presented to advisory groups and program partners, and will inform stakeholders and decision makers to help them better understand public input. Anita shared the program timeline through the development of the IBR multimodal design solution in 2022, and then turned the conversation over Katie Mangle to present active transportation design concepts.

## ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM OVERVIEW, CONTEXT, AND FRAMEWORK

Katie Mangle, IBR Technical Lead, began by introducing the technical team’s approach to active transportation designs. Katie expressed a commitment by the technical team to an inclusive approach to the team’s design concepts. Katie expressed that the program’s accessible transportation designs are intended to be accessible for all, in addition to providing opportunities for motor vehicle users to engage with alternate active transportation.

Katie then described the extent of the program area and focused the scope of the day’s discussion – understanding user experience and access; identifying desire lines and key connections both regionally and locally; and comparing options in key active transportation nodes, also known as “focus areas”.

Katie then provided a further exploration of the active transportation design framework. She defined “user experience” as the “level of comfort” at the intersection of user environment, experience, and effort. “Access” was described as ways that users can reach different areas and amenities in the program area. Katie then opened the discussion for questions. One participant asked if e-mobility, such as electric scooters and golf carts, are within the scope of the program’s design. Katie responded that electric scooters and bikes, also known as micro-mobility, are within the scope of the design concepts being presented, while golf carts are somewhat different and have not had explicit consideration in the design concepts so far. She then asked participants to prepare three pieces of scrap paper with a smiling face, a neutral face, and a frowning face to engage with the next portion of the presentation. Katie then introduced Derek Abe to lead the interactive session.

## INTERACTIVE SESSION: DESIGNING FOR PEOPLE WALKING, BIKING AND ROLLING

Derek invited participants to participate in a visual preference survey of different active transportation design concepts.

### Bridge Access

Derek shared a series of images depicting bridge access options, and asked for participants to share their favorable, neutral, or unfavorable responses by showing their responses to the camera.

- The first image depicted a raised sidewalk bordered by a bike path with metal railings on both sides of the pathway. The group had a mixed response, with 2 favorable responses, 5 neutral responses, and 4 unfavorable responses.
- The second image depicted a ramp with metal railings on both sides of the pathway, but without a physical height difference between the walking and rolling paths. The group had a mixed to negative overall response, with 1 favorable response, 4 neutral responses, and 6 unfavorable responses.
- The third image depicted a ramp embedded into a grassy hillside with two traffic flows delineated by a dashed painted line, and without rails on the sides of the path. The group had a mixed response, with 2 favorable responses, 6 neutral responses, and 3 unfavorable responses.
- The fourth image depicted a path connection over a railroad without traffic flow delineations, with more architectural detail, including walls on both sides of the path, and a packed-gravel pathway. The group had a mixed to negative response, with 3 favorable responses, 1 neutral response, and 7 unfavorable responses.

Anita then took feedback from the group on the bridge access concepts that had been presented. The group shared specific design feedback, including concerns about accessibility for travelers with vision impairment, path incline for manual wheelchairs, pathway separation for different speed travel, and safety.

## On-Street Walkways

Derek shared a series of images depicting on-street walkways, and asked for participants to share their favorable, neutral, or unfavorable responses by showing their responses to the camera.

- The first image depicted a delineated concrete path with a large retaining wall on one side and a landscape buffer bounded by a railing along the other. The group had mixed to negative overall response, with 1 favorable response, 3 neutral responses, and 7 unfavorable responses.
- The second image depicted a path that would be located next to a roadway without a physical barrier along the road, with painted lines delineating a wider walking lane from a lane subdivided for rolling traffic in opposite directions. The group had a positive overall response, with 6 and a half favorable responses, 3 and a half neutral responses and 1 unfavorable response.
- The third image depicted a combination of walkways delineated by pavers for different forms of travel bordering a transit island on one side and a paved sidewalk on the other. The group had a mixed overall

response, with 2 favorable responses, 5 neutral responses, and 3 unfavorable responses. One response was not recorded.

- The fourth image depicted a walkway between a roadway and a delineated pathway for faster travel. The group had a mixed to negative overall response, with 0 favorable responses, 6 neutral responses, and 4 unfavorable responses. One response was not recorded.
- The fifth image depicted a wider walkway including a row of trees down the center with outdoor market kiosks along one side of the wider path, and a larger plaza area on the other side. The group had a positive overall response, with 7 favorable responses, 2 neutral responses, and 1 unfavorable response. One response was not recorded.

Anita then took feedback from the group on the on-street walkway concepts that had been presented. The group shared specific design feedback about the importance of: pathway delineation, visually-impaired accessibility, pathway width, bicycle access, and community space sharing.

## On-Street Bikeways

Derek shared a series of images depicting on-street bikeways, and asked for participants to share their favorable, neutral, or unfavorable responses by showing their responses to the camera.

- The first image depicted a buffered bike lane, bordered on one side by a three-foot painted buffer running along a roadway and a row of parked cars on the other. The group had a mixed to positive overall response, with 4 favorable responses, 5 neutral responses, and 2 unfavorable responses.
- The second image depicted a protected bike lane, with a slightly raised bikeway bordered on one side by a concrete shoulder running along a roadway and a sidewalk bordering the other. The group had a positive overall response, with 9 favorable responses, 1 and a half neutral responses, and one half of an unfavorable response.
- The third image depicted a two-way separated bikeway, bordered on one side by a painted and raised buffer running along a roadway and a sidewalk on the other. The group had a positive overall response, with 6 favorable responses, 3 neutral responses, and 1 unfavorable response. One response was not recorded.
- The fourth image depicted a bikeway bordered on one side by a landscape strip buffer and a sidewalk delineated by pavers at the same height on the other. The bikeway included intermittent ramps down to,

and up from, the level of the roadway at intersections. The group had a positive overall response, with 8 favorable responses, 1 neutral response, and 1 unfavorable response. One response was not recorded.

Anita then took feedback from the group about the on-street bikeway concepts that had been presented. The group shared specific design feedback including: concern about negative climate impacts from rainwater runoff, interest in the width of sidewalks for pedestrians, desire for physical barriers to support bike safety, support for street cleaner access being prioritized, concern about proximity of cyclers to parked vehicles, and importance of wayfinding for vehicular awareness of bikeways.

## Shared Use Path

Derek shared a series of images depicting shared use paths, and asked for participants to share their favorable, neutral, or unfavorable responses by showing their responses to the camera.

- The first image depicted a wide path with two-way bicycle lanes bordered by a painted buffer, with a two-way pedestrian path on the other side of the painted buffer. The group had a positive overall response, with 9 favorable responses, 2 neutral responses, and 0 unfavorable responses.
- The second image depicted a path bordering a raised buffer along a roadway which passed under a road structure. The group had a mixed to negative overall response, with 2 favorable responses, 4 neutral responses, and 4 unfavorable responses. One response was not recorded.
- The third image depicted a path bordered on one side by a one-foot buffer along a sidewalk and a commercial area on the other. The group had a positive overall response, with 9 favorable responses, 1 neutral response, and 1 unfavorable response.
- The fourth image depicted a wide path with multiple materials used to delineate different path uses, with shoulders bordering either side of the path, including a sidewalk and bikeway. The group had a positive overall response, with 8 favorable responses, 2 neutral responses, and 1 unfavorable response.
- The fifth image depicted a simple winding asphalt path with gravel shoulders that lead into a grassy hillside. The group had a negative overall response, with 1 favorable response, 4 neutral responses, and 6 unfavorable responses.

Anita then took feedback from the group on the shared-use path concepts that had been presented. The group shared specific design feedback including: interest in the multiuse designs, concern about curved path shapes negatively impacting bicycle safety, concern about path accessibility for cleaners, and desire for wider pathways.

Anita invited participants to report back to the meeting after a 10-minute break.

## MOVE TO BREAKOUT ROOMS AFTER REVIEWING ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS MAPS

Anita welcomed the participants back to the working group. Katie and Derek introduced maps of existing active transportation networks and multiuse paths. The first map showed the bicycle network through north Portland's Hayden Island and Marine Drive areas; the second map showed the bicycle network through south Vancouver; the third map showed a high-level depiction of the major desire lines for pedestrians traffic flows; the fourth map showed a high-level depiction of the major desire lines for bicycle traffic flows.

Using the four active transportation analysis maps for supporting context, the Community Working Group then split into two breakout rooms to discuss existing conditions, existing and planned networks, and major gaps; desire lines; and major active transportation connections the program is considering addressing. Breakout room discussion leaders also posed questions to the groups for feedback: "Did we miss anything in the maps?" and "What are the most important destinations to connect to?"

### Breakout Room 1

Led by Derek Abe, with IBR support staff Zander Arnold taking notes:

- Desire for directional arrows should depend on traffic flow.
- Questions about existing data on path usage, travel speed, and meandering pedestrians.
- Emphasis on the importance of the Columbia Slough Trail for bicycle travel to Vancouver Avenue.
- Question about the future connectivity or segmentation of the Delta Park area.
- Comment about how different user types may use a shared use path differently. How will directional arrows accommodate these differences?
- Concern about C-TRAN bus connections leaving Vancouver.
- Desire for consideration of morning and evening traffic flows.

### Breakout Room 2

Led by Katie Mangle, with IBR support staff Jennifer Lutman taking notes:

- Desire to consider cyclists traveling from Portland to Vancouver Lake.
- Desire to discuss noise and elevators at the next meeting.
- Interest in how bridge height will affect two-way travel across the bridge.

- Desire to integrate existing plans and projects into the IBR design.
- Observation that bike and pedestrian flows affect one another.
- Question about what will happen with existing active transportation structures after construction.
- Support for bike lanes passing underneath roadways.
- Emphasis that transit intersections are very important for safe and comfortable facilities.
- Desire for bridge height to be sufficient for marine traffic as well as low enough for air traffic.
- Desire for clear spaces under the bridge.
- Observation that weather and lighting will influence transportation choices.
- Question about accessing Portland transit connections.
- Concern that a covered path may attract unhoused people and affect usage.

## REPORT OUT FROM GROUPS

The participants returned from breakout rooms. Anita invited one participant from each group to share their discussion with the group.

## WRAP UP

Anita shared additional engagement opportunities with the group including upcoming advisory group meetings, social media, and the program newsletter, as well as links to the recording of this meeting, meeting material presented, and the program information library. Anita reminded participants about the date and time of the next Active Transportation meeting on Thursday, October 28<sup>th</sup>, 2021 from 4:30-7:00 PM.

Anita thanked the participants for their time and adjourned the meeting at 7:00 PM.

## MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Attendees	Role/Organization
Alyson Day	At-Large Community Participant
Barbara Fields	At-Large Community Participant
Marlin Brinkley	Clark County Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee
Guthrie Straw	Oregon Environmental Council

Attendees	Role/Organization
Jan Campbell	TriMet Committee on Accessible Transportation
Jennifer Koozer	TriMet
Jim Hagar	Port of Vancouver
Katherine Kelly	City of Vancouver
Ken Williams	At-Large Community Participant
Marian Rhys	At-Large Community Participant
Mark Raggett	Portland Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Michael Newton	At-Large Community Participant
Robin Richardson	CAG Member
Taylor Eidt	C-TRAN
Tom Baltes	At-Large Community Participant

## Facilitators and Presenters

Attendees	Role/Organization
Anita Yap	Facilitator
Derek Abe	IBR Technical Lead/Presenter
Greg Johnson	IBR Program Administrator
Katie Mangle	IBR Technical Lead/Presenter



## Additional Participants

Members of the public viewed the meeting via the YouTube livestream during the meeting.

## MEETING RECORD AND MATERIALS

### Meeting Recording

A recording of the meeting is available here:

[https://youtu.be/y\\_CQLM27hQ](https://youtu.be/y_CQLM27hQ)

### Meeting Materials

The meeting materials are available here:

<https://www.interstatebridge.org/get-involved-folder/calendar/active-transportation-working-group/>