

# Bike and Walk Salem: Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update and Safe Routes to School Plan

---

## Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #1

Tuesday August 24, 2010

6:30 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.

Pringle Hall Community Center, 606 Church Street SE

## Attendees

---

### Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members

Tonya Johnson, Marion County Health  
Department  
David Fox, Salem Planning Commission and  
Business Owner  
David Fridenmaker, School Facilities  
Department  
Steve Oulman, Department of Land  
Conservation and Development  
Karen Odenthal, Marion County Planning  
Kevin Baker, School District, Transportation  
Heather Swanson, West Salem Neighborhood  
Association  
Jeff Leach, South East Salem Neighborhood  
Association  
Gary Obery, Vision 2020 and Bicycle  
Transportation Alliance  
Michael Wolfe, South Salem Cycle Works  
Carel DeWinkel, South Central Area  
Neighborhood Association  
Amador Aguilar, Enlace  
Nancy Baker-Kroft, Northeast Neighbors  
Alternate

### Project Team

Julie Warncke, City of Salem  
Kevin Hottmann, City of Salem  
Sue Geniesse, Transportation & Growth  
Management Program  
Sumi Malik, CH2M HILL  
Rory Renfro, CH2M HILL  
Bernadette Le, CH2M HILL

### Citizens in Attendance

Austin McKimmey  
Mark Wigg  
Eric Lundgren  
Kenji Sugahara, Oregon Bicycle Racing Assoc.

## Meeting Summary

This meeting summary documents the major conversation items from the August 24, 2010 meeting of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) for Bike and Walk Salem, the City of Salem's Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update and Safe Routes to School Plan. The summary is

organized by agenda item. Discussion and agenda items are documented in this summary. For details about the materials reviewed during the meeting, see meeting handouts<sup>1</sup>.

### **Agenda Overview and Introductions**

Julie Warncke opened the meeting and introduced the consultant team. Sumi gave a brief overview of the agenda and asked each attendee to introduce themselves and describe what a successful outcome of the plan would be for them. A successful plan was described as:

- Making bicycling more accessible and less frightening.
- One that the community is behind, is implementable, and is not overwhelming.
- Increase the number of individuals cycling.
- Identifying routes/facilities that people will take advantage of.
- Making school buses unnecessary as children are biking and walking.
- Reducing congestion at schools as more students are arriving at school by alternate modes.
- Reassuring parents of safety of bicycling and walking to school.
- Making bicycling part of the larger transportation conversation in Salem.
- Educating the motorists of the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Legitimizing cycling and walking to same level of cars (e.g.. in terms of amount of bicycle and walking infrastructure funding and providing needed facilities, such as parking facilities that protect bikes or making roadways safer to cross).
- Creating a more complete facility network.
- Prioritizing projects and using funds efficiently.
- Improving health in Salem by making bicycling and walking easier and safer
- Including tourism as an important reason people use the bicycling network. Consider the bicycle tourism aspect and benefits when developing the plan.
- Addressing issues of equity by locating facilities where they are needed and by encouraging members of all cultural and economic backgrounds to use the system.

### **Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update and Safe Routes to School Plan Background**

Julie provided a brief overview of the purpose and objectives of this planning effort. She described that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update will be used to update the bicycle and pedestrian elements of the Salem Transportation System Plan, Salem's long-range transportation plan, as well as possibly some implementing ordinances. The plan will include a plan for city-wide bicycle and pedestrian improvements. She also described that the Safe Routes to School Plan will focus on improving bicycling and walking routes to elementary and middle schools. The objective of the effort is to create plans that are adopted by City Council and that creates a system that is accessible for the variety of cyclists and pedestrians in Salem. Sumi also highlighted that focus of this plan is to develop policies that facilitate walking and bicycling and to create a list of facility improvements, but that encouragement and enforcement program identification and development is outside of the scope of this project.

Sumi then presented the project flowchart and schedule for the project. Attendees were led through the flow of the project and the pattern of document development, SAC review and

---

<sup>1</sup> Meeting handouts included the project schedule, the project flow chart, Draft Technical Memo 1: Audit and Plan and Policy Review, Draft Technical Memo 3: Evaluation Criteria

comments, and document presentation to larger community. The schedule was also briefly discussed, including greater time devoted to earlier tasks, public outreach, and project development with the aim that broad public support for the plan gained through a transparent process would allow for a smooth adoption process at the end.

Sumi asked the SAC members to provide comments on the best day of the week for future meetings. Tuesdays seemed to work for those in attendance, except the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesdays, which are Planning Commission meetings. One stakeholder asked if the project management team (PMT) knew what week the next meeting would occur as he is looking to schedule trips and wishes not to miss the meeting. Julie and Sumi responded that we will provide as much advance notice as possible, but that we do not have a specific week identified yet. The next SAC meeting is scheduled for the first half of November.

### **Stakeholder Advisory Committee Role, Involvement and Commitment**

As this was the first SAC meeting, Sumi led a discussion on the role of the SAC and the level of involvement and commitment involved in this committee. The purpose of this discussion was to ensure that everyone agreed and were aware of these expectations. The role of the SAC is to represent the broad range of public perspectives to the planning process, as each person will represent a different group or perspective; to review and provide feedback on documents prior to the larger community; and to bring information learned during these meetings back to the community and gather community feedback.

Six to nine SAC meetings will occur throughout the project. These meetings will last between 1 and 2 hours. SAC members were asked to notify the PMT if they would not be able to attend a meeting and to send an alternate. A single alternate throughout the process was requested to ensure that minimal review would be needed.

SAC members were requested to provide feedback on the materials and the meeting within 1 week of the meeting, unless otherwise discussed.

SAC members were asked if anyone was missing from the current SAC member list. Suggestions for additional members included:

- Parks and Recreation board member
- More business representatives – either on the committee or Julie mentioned that this might end up being a small group meeting
  - Julie stated that she would contact Chamber of Commerce.
  - Members also recommended that discussions with businesses includesanitation companies as recycling and garbage pickup can affect routes.
- Police department
- Department of Motor Vehicles

Sumi discussed the desire for SAC members to be involved in outreach events such as listening sessions, workshops, farmers markets, et cetera. The SAC was asked if there are any outreach opportunities that they felt would be beneficial to be present at. Events discussed included:

- Kidical Mass - this Sunday is the last event for this year.
- First Wednesday – This is a downtown event.

- Breakfast on Bikes, typically held the last Friday of the month

### **Purpose and Overview of Memo #1 – Audit/Plan & Policy Review**

The purpose of Memo #1 is to provide the context of walking and cycling environment in Salem. Sumi presented the list of plans and policies reviewed for the memo, the change in conditions since the last Salem TSP in 1998, and the major policy findings and recommendations. Rory presented examples discussed in Memo #1 of innovative bicycle and pedestrian facility types that were not considered when developing the 1998 Salem TSP. Although this memo and presentation does not provide the full list of potential facilities, it provided the SAC with an overview of the possibilities within Salem. Rory highlighted that while bicycling in Salem he had identified some of these newer types of facilities already in place.

The group was asked if any additional plans should be included in this memo. The School District Facility Plan and the City of Salem Parks Master Plan were recommended for inclusion by a SAC member. A copy of the School District Facility Plan will be sent to Julie.

The group discussed the need for bike parking outside of downtown. One member asked if there is a way to require businesses to have bike parking. Julie stated that there is currently a requirement for new construction but that it does not cover when a use changes or minor renovations. The group also discussed the importance of the location of bike parking, the proper triggers for requiring parking, as well as city and consumer encouragement mechanisms to facilitate additional parking.

A neighborhood representative highlighted that not all neighborhoods want sidewalk improvements and that this perspective should be included in the planning process. Rory discussed that pedestrian improvements that do not include the construction of sidewalks could be discussed in future tasks, as one of the many pedestrian improvement types.

The group also discussed concerns related to bicycle safety and diagonal, head-in parking in the downtown area. Julie and Kevin Hottmann discussed the political and policy challenges with changing the parking design. Kevin described the upcoming change along Commercial Street that will retain the diagonal, head-in parking but will increase the safety of bikes by removing a travel lane and marking sharrows to encourage bikes to ride further from the parked cars. This makes bikes more visible to cars backing up and gives bikes more time to react if they see a car backing out of a parking space.

Two community members provided comment on other facility updates that would be beneficial to bicyclists. These improvements included retrofitting steel grates to be safer for bicyclists and including notification of stores and block numbers on wayfinding signs, specifically signs that are on off-street multi-use paths such as along Salem Parkway. Kevin Hottmann encouraged SAC members to let him know of locations where there are problems with stormwater grates.

### **Purpose and Overview of Memo #3 – Evaluation Criteria**

Rory gave brief presentation of Memo #3 including the purpose and importance of the document as the criteria will help the group objectively prioritize projects for the final plan. The SAC was asked to review the document and provide feedback on if the correct criteria are included and if any criteria are missing.

### **Public Comment Period**

Members of the public were asked if they had any additional comments near the end of the meeting. One individual was concerned about the rate of bicycling has not increased even as the city has dramatically increased the amount of bike lanes. He encouraged the PMT and SAC to look at cities with high rates of bicycling for guidance as to how to improve the mode split in Salem. The group discussed cities that could potentially serve as examples. He is also interested in the City pursuing opportunities for off-street paths and in looking at the mode split by commute-shed as that may provide insight.

### **Next Steps**

The SAC was asked to review and provide comments on

- Memos # 1 and 3 by August 31<sup>st</sup>. Please send feedback to Sumi and Julie. The comments will then be reviewed and incorporated to the final version of the memos.
- The Critical Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) routes. The group was asked to identify routes that should be prioritized on the prepared map. The map was present at the meeting and will be emailed out to the group for review and feedback. A focus group will also be convened to review the map and provide comments.
- The SAC was also asked to provide thoughts on focus areas (geographic areas) for pedestrian and bicycle facilities inventory and ideas for small group meetings/focus groups.