

SE/NE 50s Bikeway Project
Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #1
August 11, 2010

Trinity Fellowship Church, 2700 SE 67th Avenue
6:30 – 8:30 PM

Agenda

- I Introductions**

- II Project Background**

- III Process**
 - a) Scope/ schedule**
 - b) Citizens Advisory Committee**

- IV Project Goals & Objectives**

- V Existing Conditions**

- VI Improvement Options (tool box)**

- VII Next Steps**

SE/NE 50s Bikeway Project

Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting #1

August 11, 2010

Trinity Fellowship Church, 2700 SE 67th Avenue

6:30 – 8:30 PM

Meeting Summary

CAC Members Attending:

Chase Ballew, Central Northeast Neighbors District Neighborhood Coalition

Alicia Crain, City of Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee

Dave Crout, Rose City Park Neighborhood Association

Matt Glynn, Woodstock Comm. Business Association

Sandra Hay Magdaleno, South Tabor Neighborhood Association

Kenny Heggem, Woodstock Neighborhood Association

Leah Hyman, Southeast Uplift District Neighborhood Coalition

Nellie Korn, Creston Kenilworth Neighborhood Association

Gerik Kransky, Bicycle Transportation Alliance

Ilana Mullin, Foster Powell Neighborhood Association

John Mulvey, 'at large' citizen representative

Joe Recker, North Tabor Neighborhood Association

Seth Richardson, Foster Business Association

Bruce Treat, Mt Tabor Neighborhood Association

Chris Yake, 'at large' citizen representative

Members of the public

Ian Stude

Bill Barber, Central Northeast Neighbors District Neighborhood Coalition

City of Portland staff

Rich Newlands, PBOT Project Management

Sarah Figliozzi, PBOT Transportation Planning

Jenny Tower, PBOT Traffic Operations

Roger Geller, PBOT Bicycle Coordinator

Note: All materials sent to the CAC members and distributed during the meeting are available on the project website, [here](http://www.portlandonline.com/transportation/50sbikeway).

<http://www.portlandonline.com/transportation/50sbikeway>

Project Background

Bureau of Transportation's (PBOT) Bicycle Coordinator, Roger Geller, talked about the history of Portland's bicycle network expansion, the significant increases in the rate of bicycling, the goals of the Portland Bike Plan, and the role of the NE/SE 50's Bikeway in

the larger bicycle network. The project is funded with \$1.5 in federal transportation funding.

Process

PBOT Project Manager Rich Newlands described the envisioned process for the development of NE/SE 50's Bikeway Plan. The Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Technical Advisory Committee would be advising staff on the development of the project's design criteria and project objectives, the development of design alternatives, the evaluation of those alternatives, and the final project recommendation. It is envisioned that the CAC will meet approximately 3 to 4 times and hold at least one open house. It is possible that the final project recommendation will be completed by the end of this year or early next year.

The CAC) is made up of representatives from the Neighborhood and Business Associations along the proposed project alignment as well as other community stakeholder groups. The CAC will be advisory to staff. The final project recommendation will be submitted to the PBOT Director. If the CAC did not agree with the final staff recommendation or if there was a split among the group, a minority report could also be submitted.

The project team is concerned that the CAC is truly representative of the neighborhoods that the project will serve and impact. As such, Rich asked the group to offer suggestions of other stakeholders who might be missing from the current CAC. The project team is also asking for recommendations of stakeholder/community groups that should know about and participate in the design of the project.

Rich noted that the project has an informal Technical Advisory Committee made up of City staff from Transportation, other Bureaus, such as Fire and Environmental Services, and outside agencies, such as TriMet.

The question was asked whether or not the route will be segmented. Rich answered that in terms of outreach, yes, the project team is considering different methods to reach out to the various constituents along the route given that design issues will be very different in the different sections. Rich also noted that in terms of design and construction, yes, there is an option to design the project so that it is constructed in phases. This would be the case if the existing budget is not sufficient for the complete desired design.

The question was asked whether a mailing could be sent out early on in the design process to alert local residents of the project. This idea was noted. Rich also noted that the project team will be presenting at the many neighborhood association meetings during October. Again, those in attendance were asked to give the project team recommendations for other groups that should be visited.

Other suggestions for outreach ideas were raised including distributing information at Sunday Parkways, a CAC or community ride of the project route, and conducting a survey of cyclists along the route. Rich also noted that the project team believes that we need to reach out to the non-cycling community.

Project Goals & Objectives

Rich outlined the draft project goals and objectives. These goals and objectives will assist the CAC and staff in evaluating design options later in the process. This draft/existing goals and objectives (available on the project website) were compiled from the Portland Bicycle Plan and Transportation System Plan. The project goals and objectives are a work in progress.

The question was asked how the proposed alignment was chosen and whether there is a blank slate in terms of alternative alignments. Roger answered that bikeway routes are chosen by looking at a number of factors, including: how they fit into the existing network so that cyclists can easily arrive at their destinations, the directness of the route, comfort of cyclists (including traffic volumes and speeds), safe crossings, elevation changes, etc. Roger also noted that this project is an opportunity to create a world class biking facility. Rich also added that given our existing project goals and desire to meet the needs of all cyclists (those who are confident and those who are interested but concerned), the project could consider investigating two alignments (direct route and a low stress residential route).

An additional design objective was suggested: design innovation

Existing Conditions

The project team has collected the following data:

- Auto speed/volume counts
- Parking supply and demand
- Turn counts (in order to understand how an intersection functions)
- Gap studies – this length and frequency of gaps between cars to understand how easy it is to cross a street)
- Accident history
- Cross section widths (street width distance and the individual widths of street elements such as sidewalks, on-street parking, travel lanes)

A description of the current conditions and issues were discussed for the route segments, moving south to north:

SE Woodstock Blvd to SE Foster

This section is a 'neighborhood collector' per the Transportation System Plan (TSP). This means that higher than average traffic volumes are to be expected. However this section is also characterized by higher speeds (5 to 7 miles over the speed limit). Daily traffic volumes are 11,000 – 13,000.

This section is also a Emergency Response Route. This means that many traffic calming tools are not applicable due to the fact that they could reduce the response rate of emergency vehicles.

The group also talked about the implications of striping bike lanes on SE 52nd between SE Woodstock and SE Division. The street width for this entire length is 40 feet. In order to accommodate 5 ft bike lanes in either direction and 11 ft travel lanes, on-street parking (8 ft) on one side of the street will need to be removed.

A comment was made that the section between SE Holgate and SE Foster includes many subdivisions that lack off-street parking. Removal of on-street parking in this section would remove their only parking options. This comment was noted and the project team will be conducting more research on the parking inventory along SE 52nd south of Division.

A comment was made about the possibility of adding crosswalks as a mitigation for the removal of the on-street parking. This comment was noted.

A question was asked about the possibility of alternating the on-street parking from on side of the street to the other, back and forth. Jenny responded that yes this technique would have a traffic calming effect and would be more equitable in terms of parking loss. However she noted that it would result in more parking spaces being lost due to the transition necessary when shifting the center lane back and forth.

SE Foster to SE Powell

This section includes a three lane cross section which make accommodating bike lanes difficult. There are a lot of right hand turning movements at this intersection.

The question was asked whether or not it is feasible to widen the street. Rich responded that the right of way acquisition necessary to widen the street for any length is very expensive. There are some areas of the route where the project will explore the costs of very minor widening at the corner of SE 60th and Division to accommodate bus movement.

SE Powell to SE Division

This section is a local street per the TSP however it is acting as a neighborhood collector in terms of traffic volumes and speeds. Speeds are 5-7 miles over the speed limit. Daily traffic volumes are 6,500.

SE Division to SE Lincoln

This section is characterized by higher traffic volumes than what is standard for a local street. The project team believes this is due to cut-through traffic from Division who want to avoid the light at SE 50th.

One option for dealing with unwanted cut-through traffic is to install a semi diverter which eliminates vehicles entering from one direction. Physical (versus signage) semi diverters are not an option however on routes with transit lines. Rich discussed the current situation with the bus line #71 which travels east /west on Lincoln between SE 60th and SE 50th Avenues because of bus turning difficulty at SE 60th and Division.

SE Lincoln to SE Hawthorne

Some concern at the intersection of SE Lincoln and SE 52nd Ave regarding bike on bike conflicts due to the steep decline and associated speeds. Possible traffic calming needs between SE Lincoln and SE Hawthorne.

SE Hawthorne to E Burnside

Traffic volumes and speeds are low in this section as the route is naturally traffic calmed with very narrow street widths. Some issues regarding visibility and sight clearances at the intersection with SE Hawthorne, SE Belmont, and SE Stark.

One comment was raised about the hills along the route in this section which make the route strenuous. Some issues regarding visibility and sight clearances at the intersection with

E Burnside to NE Glisan

Rich and Jenny discussed the crossing at E Burnside . The curb to curb cross section will limit bikeway tool options. They also noted that there is an existing traffic signal at NE 54th which suggests moving the route east to take advantage of the signal.

The question was asked as to whether a signal could be moved. Jenny said that if the traffic volumes warrant a signal then the City could not remove it. Many commented that this intersection appeared to have low traffic volumes.

NE Glisan to NE Halsey

The hospital entrance is responsible for the higher than average traffic volumes in this section. North of the I-84 however traffic volumes go down.

NE Hancock & NE 57th

The bike crossing of 57th from Hancock may be difficult. Striping the bike lane will also require the removal of both side of on-street parking. However parking utilization rates for this section are very low.

A question was raised about existing curb extensions that may conflict with bike lanes. Rich noted that yes, there were two locations that will need to be modified if bike lanes were striped.

Improvement Options (tool box)

Due to time limitations this portion of the agenda was dropped. However the information to be presented to the group is contained in the handout, Bikeway Facility Design: Survey of Best Practices, which was distributed to the group ahead of time and is also available on the project website.

Next Steps

At the second meeting of the CAC, the project team will return with design alternatives and revised version of the project goals and design objectives based on what was heard during the meeting.

The second meeting is tentatively set for the last week of September. Date, time, and venue will be confirmed as soon as possible.

Other:

- CAC members are encouraged to contact the project team with any comments or ideas. The project team will respond and cc the group in order to start an online discussion prior to the next meeting.
- A date will be proposed for a group ride of the route alignment.
- All materials will be uploaded to the project website
- The zoning map for the project route was requested and will be emailed to the group