



Benton County Public Works
Corvallis-Albany Bikeway Advisory Group
Meeting #1 Advisory Group Orientation

Wednesday, January 25, 12:00-2:00 p.m.

Meeting Notes

Attendance:

Members

Byron Cook
 Bob Durst
 Chris Foulke (absent)
 Mac Gillespie
 Kevin Grant
 Patrick (Pat) Hayes
 Michael McGowan
 Mary Pat Parker
 Ken Reynolds
 Rick Robinson
 Jennifer Ward

Agency Liaisons/Advisors

Frannie Brindle
 Ron Irish
 Sheriff Scott Jackson (absent)
 Lee Lazaro (absent)
 Jim Patton
 Undersheriff Greg Ridler
 Greg Wilson

County Staff

Josh Wheeler
 Laurie Starha

Consultant Team

Libby Barg
 Bruce Prenguber

Summary

At the first meeting of the Corvallis-Albany Bikeway Advisory Group, members were presented an overview of the group’s assignment and schedule. A brief introduction to the project area and potential routes was provided. The remainder of the meeting focused on proposed evaluation criteria that will be used at future meetings to compare bikeway routes.

Evaluation Criteria Discussion Notes

Advisory Group members discussed the proposed evaluation criteria. Following are their comments and suggestions.

Evaluation Criteria	Comments
Connects to destinations (parks, cities, employers, schools, public transit, trailheads)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Consideration should be given to how the location of the bikeway and potential destination impacts/serves diverse populations, including low income residents and other underserved populations. – Add “current and future pathways” as destinations – Think regionally about connections (for example, Corvallis to Sea Trail)
Practical for recreational use and commuting (distance and terrain)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A multi-purpose bikeway may be less attractive for all users. One size may not fit all. – Need to consider if pathway is good for recreation or for commuting during evaluation.

Evaluation Criteria	Comments
Fits rural character / protects farmland	– Farming activities create dust and spraying regulations are getting tougher. Need to think about how these activities will impact bikeway users.
Supports visitor travel / tourism	– Is the trail about tourism or more about improving local livability? – Bikeway is an amenity for visitors. (Forest Grove is a good example)
Maximizes traveling safety (configuration, crossings)	– Add “for all modes” – Consider how addition of a bikeway could limit future expansion of traffic capacity on roadways.
Allows emergency access; inhibits crime	– Public safety is very important. – Crime would be inhibited if the pathway is well used.
Minimizes environmental impacts (wetlands, trees, habitat, stormwater runoff)	– Add “maximizes environmental benefits”
Minimizes impacts on neighbors (construction and operation)	
Minimizes operation and maintenance costs	– Add construction costs (note that this is order of magnitude so that a very expensive alternative can be identified early in the process). – Select the best path, then think about money. – Change “costs” to “resource needs”
Provides other benefits (transportation choices, aesthetics, economic, health)	– These benefits are already captured in the other criteria. – Health relates to more than exercise. An off-road route away from car exhaust is healthier than an on-road option. – Having access to pathways has been proven to improve mental health.

Other comments:

- Consider long-term solutions. A perfect path may not be possible right now—think about a hybrid that would be beneficial now and can be improved over time.
- Would be good to see how other communities have solved bikeway issues.

Evaluation Criteria Ranking

Advisory Group members used electronic polling to rank how appropriate the proposed evaluation criteria are for the Corvallis-Albany Bikeway on a scale of 1 not appropriate to 7 very appropriate. All criteria scored above 5 and are viewed as appropriate. “Tier 1” criteria include safety, connection to destinations, practical for its intended use, and fits the rural character of the project area / protects farmland. Results of the polling exercise are below.

Evaluation Criteria	Appropriateness Ranking
Tier 1	
– Maximizes traveling safety (configuration, crossings)	6.6
– Connects to destinations (parks, cities, employers, schools, public transit, trailheads)	6.4
– Practical for recreational use and commuting (distance and terrain)	6.4
– Fits rural character / protects farmland	6.0
Tier 2	
– Minimizes environmental impacts (wetlands, trees, habitat, stormwater runoff)	5.8
– Minimizes impacts on neighbors (construction and operation)	5.8
– Provides other benefits (transportation choices, aesthetics, economic, health)	5.8
– Allows emergency access; inhibits crime	5.7
– Supports visitor travel / tourism	5.3
– Minimizes operation and maintenance costs	5.2