

Bicycle Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

September 10, 2013

BAC Members Present:

Ian Stude, Committee Vice-Chairperson; Matthew Arnold; Andrew Haliburton; Tigue Howe; Heather McCarey; Rob Sadowsky; Yonit Sharaby

BAC Members Absent:

Suzanne Veaudry Casaus, Committee Chairperson Roger Averbeck; Anne Duston; Keith Liden; Mark Ginsberg; Shayna Rehberg

Guests:

Ryan Palmer; Brian Lockwood; Carl Larson; Scott Mizze; Dave Coburn; Cage Byrd (PPB), Dan Bower (PBOT), Roger Geller (PBOT)

The meeting convened at 6:00 pm

Announcements

PBOT is seeking a representative to serve on the Project Working Group (PWG) for the Division-Midway Neighborhood Street Plan. No takers at meeting, though Roger will send out an announcement to the full committee.

Clarification: Chris Achterman will be the representative for the 20s bikeway project.

Active Transportation Plan Discussion

Ian Stude brought up the August 13th letter regarding the regional Active Transportation Plan (ATP) from 22 Mayors in the region to Metro Council President Tom Hughes. That letter presented their concerns about the ATP, even though those expressed concerns contravened existing policies held by some of those cities. The committee decided to develop a sign-on letter similar to the Mayor's letter expressing support for the ATP. The letter would be signed by all regional bicycle and pedestrian advisory committees and sustainability committees and sent to Metro. Matt A agreed to write the letter and get it to Ian. Rob S asked Carl Larson to identify committees throughout the region willing to sign on to it.

Barbur Boulevard

In response to ODOT's 9/5/13 memo regarding Barbur Boulevard, committee members agreed they would individually call each Commissioner to express the importance that a sufficient evaluation be conducted to assess the potential of a road diet on this corridor. The committee will also draft a letter to City Council urging their support.

Reformation of the Bicycle Advisory Committee

Roger provided a recap of the August meeting based on August's meeting notes.

The intent of this effort is for the BAC to provide a recommendation to the Director of PBOT and the Commissioner in Charge of Transportation on how to reform the BAC in order to more effectively achieve the policy goals identified in the Portland Bicycle Plan for 2030.

A question arose as to whether PBOT staff has been discussing what a reformulated BAC would look like. Roger indicated that there has been little discussion since August and that the topic remains wide open.

Committee members began to discuss the structure a re-formed committee would take. They recognized it should be structured to:

1. represent various constituencies
2. mobilize various constituencies
3. reflect equity (some models would include neighborhood representatives)
4. Advance desired policy goals
5. Continue to advise PBOT and the City of Portland
6. Maintain a focus on policy, big picture and big projects
7. Maintain a technical advisory committee that is associated with the principal BAC but is not necessarily a sub-committee of BAC members.

There was also recognition that there is a value in having neighborhood representatives on the committee who had detailed local knowledge of needs and operations.

What's needed to advance this conversation?

Either a fully fleshed out recommendation or a statement of key needs and desired outcomes.

Questions that arose:

Q: What would be the relationship of this committee relative to an advocacy committee?

A: Advocates can do things that an advisory committee can not

Q: Concerns about equity and "elitist" approach.

A: As one committee member put it "go big or go home." If what is required to achieve the 25% mode split goal is a more prominent committee comprised of movers and shakers, then so be it.

The discussion continued in this vein with recognition that the BAC is not currently able to "compete" with more prominent committees, such as the Portland Freight Committee. The current discussions about Barbur Blvd bring that to light.

At this point the discuss turned to consideration of whether the BAC should exist as a committee or if it should instead become an Active Transportation Commission and operated similarly to the Design Commission and Planning and Sustainability

Commission.

A two-part proposal was advanced:

1. Quickly advance the idea of a technical subcommittee in order to keep moving forward with input on projects
2. Select a small group to meet with the PBOT Director and/or Commissioner in Charge of Transportation to flesh out Committee v. Commission.

A technical subcommittee would meet perhaps 4-6 times per year and would focus exclusively on providing technical expertise. Members would also attend CAC/project meetings.

The following people will suss out the advantages/disadvantages of a committee v. commission structure and report back by October with a white paper/memo: Rob Sadowsky, Matt Arnold, Ian Stude, Susan Veaudry-Casaus and Brian Lockwood. They will be assisted by Roger Geller.

The following people will work to suss out the structure and membership of a technical subcommittee: Matt Arnold, Heather McCarey, Yonit Sharaby and Carl Larson.

Committee members noted that there may be a technical issue as members terms end in December.

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 pm