

City of Portland
Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Tuesday, February 21, 2012
Draft Meeting Notes

Committee Members:

David Aulwes*
Roger Averbek*
Don Baack
Carolyn Briggs*
Betsy Clapp
Daniel Friedman
Marianne Fitzgerald*
Rebecca Hamilton*
Erin Kelley
Doug Klotz (vice chair)*
Rod Merrick
Elizabeth Mros-O'Hara*
Ellison Pearson
Marian Rhys*
David Sale
Rich Staley
Darla Sturdy

**Indicates a committee member in attendance*

Bureau of Transportation Staff

April Bertelsen, Pedestrian Coordinator
Chloe Ritter, Staff Assistant
Paul Smith, Transportation Planning Division Director

Guests:

Katja Dillman, Milena Malone

Meeting called to order 7:08 pm

Sullivan's Gulch Trail Concept Plan – Paul Smith (PBOT) presented on the SG Trail Plan.

Right now the project is in the planning stage. The project advisory committee has unanimously agreed on the conceptual design and plan. The project has a set of principles, goals and criteria. One key note is that this should be a multi-use trail, not only for bikes. The trail may be on the TSP maps only for bikes right now, but it is intended for pedestrians as well. Paul reviewed the plan's principles (which can also be seen on the [Parks project website](#)). April then reviewed the City walkways, which often overlap with major transit streets. She noted that they are "policy" city walkways, not all of the streets have sidewalks constructed.

Paul described the conceptual cross-section, which is next to the single-track railroad. The cross-section shows the typical distance from rail centerline (approximately 25 feet). The Sullivan's Gulch trail is planned to be 5.65 miles long. 26% of the alignment is on land currently owned by City, 64% currently on railroad-owned land, and the remainder on ODOT land or private property.

The trail crosses about 20 bridges and will be able to go under each one. The path will not have a slope of more than 5% (which is close to flat). There are also lots of potential connections (the concept plan identifies 17, though more may be possible), but there are a few places where it is not possible to connect (where it is too steep, for example).

Paul explained some sample segments of the trail:

- The connection from I-205 to the trail: ODOT has already given permission to build on their land. West of I-205, the trail goes onto railroad land (within 30' of the track).

- At Jonesmore St: This segment is owned by the City. The 12-15' path is 50' from the rail track and is 20' higher.
- 60th Ave: The trail is still about 20' higher than the rail track but is within rail right of way (within 30' of the track). The trail is on a high retaining wall and has a fence between it and the railroad track.
- At Sandy/Hollywood Transit Center: There are lots of buildings in the area including Providence building. There are potential connections near 24 Hour Fitness. This segment is also an exception to the typical 30' offset from the railroad – because of how Halsey St connects to Sandy Blvd, the trail is offset just 17' from the center of the rail track. The trail will also be narrower here (12' with 1' on each side), but it's a short section (Sandy to 39th).
- Lloyd District: Here UPRR only owns 30' of land north of the rail track (normally it is 50'). One proposal at this location is to widen the existing sidewalk on Lloyd Blvd. Another option is to build a lower trail. (Both options would require retaining walls). BOTH are recommended because, due to the steep slopes, there is no good way to connect to Lloyd Blvd.

PAC - Questions/Comments

- Marian – It seems really tight in the section where the U-Store facility is.
 - A: The western-most building is the headquarters of U-Store. This building is 30' from the trail's centerline. In the short term, this building is a problem – the committee's advised "best" alignment will go through the building. In the future, re-development will probably require that the trail be included (through the TSP and Comprehensive Plan). In the meantime, the trail can go as far as Halsey and 32nd.
- Roger – Given the parallel city bikeways north and south of this corridor, where is the Sullivan's Gulch in the City's priorities, and where is funding?
 - A: The policy context of this plan is at least 15 years old (it is in the regional trails plan and the 1996 bike plan). But until this planning process it wasn't clear if it was feasible. This plan looks at the alignment, feasibility, railroad and property issues. But adoption of this plan by City Council does not identify funding or establish priority.
- Carolyn – The Gladstone Planning Commission several years ago referred to this discussion. Is the trail totally open where it goes under bridges (that is, not a tunnel)?
 - A: Yes.
 - Will the openings under bridges be fenced off so people don't sleep under there?
 - A: The trail will go next to the northern-most chamber of every bridge support (where there is at least 10' vertical clearance and at least 10' width). It will be well-lit, but it can't be fully caged and still allow the trail through. At all the connections to the street, the trail will be accessible by police and ambulance.
- Carolyn – If there isn't money for both the upper and lower sections at Lloyd, will you only do the lower trail?
 - A: That can't be determined at this point.
- Rebecca – What are potential problems with air quality, and what is the potential mitigation?
 - A: Currently someone at the city is taking Noise readings (which is another problem). PBOT is still looking for someone to study air quality, possibly Miguel Figliozzi at PSU.
- Marianne – What about a health impact study? Have other places have done this with trails?
 - A: It is not in the scope for this project's time and budget.
- Marianne – With this much pavement, where are stormwater facilities?
 - A: CH2MHill should have this information. The Springwater Corridor may have pervious pavement? With no cars, there is no pollution runoff, but sidewalks require stormwater facilities anyways. Paul or April will talk to BES.
- Elizabeth – This seems like a nice bike facility, but other than near Hollywood, pedestrians will probably mostly be in neighborhoods. If this trail is put into long-term plans, how does this affect future rail efficiency? (For example, rail may be more sustainable in future)

- A: PBOT has been in frequent discussions with UP, and they are generally positive discussions.
- Doug – Does this project limit UP in the future? For example from putting in second track?
- A: UP will have to analyze their possibilities.
- Are there rail-served properties or spurs at the east end? Will there be future needs for those properties?
- A: None of the rail spurs are currently being used.
- Doug – can you design the project to preserve future use of the rail spurs?
- A: No, that would kill the project.

Hot Topics, Points of Interest, Successes

- Marianne – The PBOT budget is out for review. What is Dan Bower’s new Active Transportation group and how does that relate to the Planning group?
 - A: Roger Gellar, April Bertelsen and Sarah Figliozzi would be moved out of Planning into to Active Transport with the current Transportation Options. Greg Raisman, Mark Lear and Sharon White would also move out of operations into Active Transportation. Options and Planning are also getting cut by 30%. Tom Miller, Rob Burchfield and Dan Bower will put more information out soon.
 - Budget Hearings start next week – for more information before then, ask Tom Miller.
- Roger – ODOT installed rapid flash beacons at 4900 SW Barbur – it is great to see this on an urban state highway. He has been there several times with handouts that inform pedestrians how it works. There are still safety concerns – some vehicles in the fast lane still do not yield. Sharon White will be going to police bureau for enforcement.
- Roger – At the last PAC meeting, we approved a motion to write a letter of support for the SW Barbur pedestrian safety projects (SW 19th – 26th). He also got letters of support from others and testified at the OTC hearing, but they didn’t change the staff recommendations. Roger was the only person there testifying for a project that hadn’t been recommended. The final decision is deferred to March 21, but the public hearing is probably closed. At the hearing, staff said safety is embedded in criteria but is not a primary stand-alone criterion. April says PBOT and ODOT are planning to meet to find other funds.
 - Katja – Roger’s testimony was valuable; the Mayor’s office received a call afterwards.
- April – the SW 46th St street vacation hearing is tomorrow morning. April has a draft letter which the PAC reviewed. April showed a map – the city may vacate 46th on St Luke’s property (Florida to California St), but there will be a pedestrian connection built and dedicated back to the city. If they don’t carry this out for any reason, after 2 years it reverts back. There may also be an easement on Florida St.
 - Marianne has the ordinance and a letter from the church committing to the path.
 - Doug says the Master Plan shows the property further east, so the sidewalk would be further east. This would mean it’s about 150’ from 45th (and further from 46th).
 - Roger – For clarification, this is separated, not walking through the parking lot? Yes – it has to be a dedicated all-weather path, not for vehicles.
 - In general the PAC is opposed to giving away ROW. But Marianne noted that St Lukes does a lot of good, and the community supports this plan.
 - Commissioner Fritz’s office had an interest in extending California through St Lukes as a pedestrian connection.
 - The old Master Street Plan shows a bike/pedestrian connection from Florida.
 - The PAC would support the connection on California to the west edge of the property.
 - The PAC would like the letter to maintain opposition to the ROW vacation, on principle, but include support for the added pedestrian connection.
- The PAC reviewed the draft of the letter and said the changes looked good. (Roger reminded April that the letterhead needs to be updated).

MOTION: Doug moved to submit the letter, and Carolyn seconded. Six voted in favor, 0 were opposed, and Roger and Marianne abstained.

- For the subdivision being built at SE 35th and Woodward, should the pedestrian connection be required? The standard is 330', but would not connect to other walkways. David asked if the PAC should push on this.
 - Doug asked, should we pass up this connection because we can't connect further?
 - The applicant said that putting in a pedestrian connection would conflict with their plan for the site. But the code says you should be able to see straight through.
 - David asked, in big picture, does this connection really matter? Doug replied if we give in here, where CAN we enforce this policy? David asked if we have an unenforceable policy, and said that this particular block is not an issue – he'd like to see policy that solves real problems, not one that just creates conflict.
 - Another point - should the nine households that would directly benefit from this path be prioritized (as compared to a path at SE 35th which would improve connectivity for many more households)?
 - Roger said the PAC has to be a watchdog on these issues and stay informed, but is this the job of the PAC, or should the city enforce their policies better? David replied that the PAC should support the city where needed. In this case the city won't win anything by enforcing a pedestrian connection requirement.
 - The PAC doesn't know how they can track pedestrian requirements for every development, unless someone gets on an email list to receive notice about it.
 - Doug sent his own letter (not associated with the PAC) about this development.
 - Carolyn asked if it is possible to write a letter recognizing the city's pedestrian connection standards. April replied that the PAC could discuss the issue more generally. Elizabeth said it feels like the PAC is having this battle often, and we may want to track it so that in the future we could refer to a list of past problems.
- No one was able to go to North Williams SAC meeting this week. But the PAC has concerns about the N Williams New Seasons related to how they did their Hawthorne store. For example, there was too much stuff in the sidewalk that should have been on the New Seasons property, such as bike parking and café seating.
 - David asked if the PAC should keep supporting staff on this. The PAC is not prepared to write a letter at this point, but could we ask New Seasons design representatives to come to the PAC?
 - Doug is concerned that the city isn't enforcing their requirements. He wrote an email as an individual.
 - The rest of PAC should learn more and Doug can circulate his email and share whatever information he has (site plans, pictures, etc). Then the committee will decide if they want to do anything about the New Seasons.
- Marian said the North Portland Road/Columbia Blvd St Johns plan had a recent contentious meeting. Fessenden (which is mostly residential, but has lots of traffic) is difficult to cross. The design team is proposing a rapid flash beacon at the curve where it turns to St Louis, and proposing pedestrian islands near bus stops. However current neighbors are not sure they like it. They'll probably reconsider locations. The focus is now more on pedestrians than trucks, with some work going on to try and divert trucks to other roads.
- Marian also reported on the North Portland Greenway. This project is led by Parks, not Transportation. The alignment is still uncertain in a few places (the Rose Quarter, St Johns bridge, and near the railroad track). There will be an open house in May, and Marian will have more details by then.
- Marianne reiterated that people should go online to see the cuts, additions and realignments in the budget that will affect sidewalks.
- Doug was at the recent crosswalk enforcement action. It is the first one at night, and police gave out 20+ tickets. Sharon walked out in a white jacket, and vehicles didn't always stop. But

when Doug walked out in his dark jacket, police said they couldn't enforce it because they couldn't see him. Is this the policy? Lots of 'real' pedestrians wear dark clothes.

- April reported that lighting and transportation staffs are planning a nighttime field trip. This will be a learning visit so staff know what the lighting standards are.
- Roger reminded the PAC about the Transportation Safety Summit on March 13.

Review and Approval of November, December Meeting Notes

Doug moved and Roger seconded to approve the November and December notes. It was unanimously approved.

Pedestrian Asset Management

April updated the PAC on this topic. She will be putting together information on how to prioritize maintenance and asset management with the PAC's support. Rod will also be the main PAC member involved with the details of this (he and April met with the director). Additionally, they will look at vegetation management. April and Rod will come back with a draft proposal. On the vegetation side, Tom Miller seems supportive of the PAC's concerns. BDS should enforce, with PBOT's support, the requirement that vegetation should be trimmed back. On road shoulders, this is a little more complex. There could be a pilot effort on some key shoulder routes. The city should try education first in a community-led effort, rather than going first to code enforcement. Mark Lear and his team will be looking at parking and can look for shoulder maintenance opportunities at the same time.

- April said the PAC has an opportunity to recommend some short corridors (3-12 blocks) that have specific connections (for example, to schools). The PAC can recommend these for the pilot.
- Roger suggested this could also be leveraged with an existing project.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:05 pm