

---

CITY OF PORTLAND  
PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE



NOTES

---

Tuesday, November 18, 2014

7:00 – 9:00 PM

Portland Building, 1120 SW 5<sup>th</sup> Ave, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor Hawthorne Room

Committee Members:	Alternate Members:
David Aulwes*	Chase Ballew*
Roger Averbeck*	Anthony Buczek*
Don Baack*	Boris Kaganovich
David Crout*	Lillian Karabaic
Marianne Fitzgerald*	Scott Kocher
Rebecca Hamilton*	Eve Nilenders
Melissa Kaganovich	Ray Tanner
Erin Kelley	Bridger Wineman
Arlene Kimura*	
Doug Klotz*	
Noel Mickelberry	
Rod Merrick*	
Elizabeth Mros-O'Hara*	
Suzanne Stahl*	
Jonathan Winslow	

\* Indicates committee members in attendance

**Bureau of Transportation Staff:**

Sara Schooley, Pedestrian Coordinator  
Margi Bradway

**Others:**

Pam Johnson  
Jessica Horning, ODOT  
Nick Falbo  
Hugh McGavick

**7:05 – 7:30 Introductions, Hot Topics, Points of Interest, Successes**

- **Guests – Margi Bradway, AT Division Manager**  
AT Division includes safety (high-crash corridors, vision zero), programs (Safe Routes to School, Sunday Parkways), and operations (neighborhood greenways, coordination with maintenance). Two issues on Margi's radar:

- Vision Zero – AT Division has applied for funding to do policy work including creating a stakeholder group to create goals. This is currently not staffed, but they are pursuing funding.
- Livable Streets Initiative – Using public streets as public places. Placemaking in vein of Sunday Parkways and the closed alley near Voodoo Doughnuts. Potentially launching “play streets” program – looking for street closures in areas where children don’t have as many opportunities to play (no nearby parks or schools). AT is working with permitting to accomplish this.

Doug brought up cut-through traffic on SE Clinton. AT is currently creating a neighborhood greenways report which would look at traffic volumes, speeds, ridership, other activities going on; which are functioning, which are not; and recommendations to upgrade legacy greenways such as Clinton and Tillamook. Don commented that the Greenways bill was supposed to include designation of urban trails in SW as greenways in order to take advantage of 20 MPH limit, but it hasn’t happened. Margi will look into this.

- **Metro design challenge advisory group – Elizabeth**

Looking at how to connect OHSU to transit station on Naito or Barbur. Neighborhood (Friends of Terwilliger) preferred the designs that made the pedestrian connection as invisible as possible and were skeptical pedestrians will actually use it. The tunnel was favorite design, but there are safety concerns. PAC has concerns of access for disability access. If the design doesn’t meet accessibility needs, OHSU will end up running shuttles. In addition, OHSU may be undergoing some significant expansion and construction in the future that would require added capacity or infrastructure to the connection.

- **Parking Advisory Committee – Rod**

The Parking Advisory Committee meeting was a discussion of zoning code and parking code. A number of people wanted to see what goals of the project are, which haven’t been articulated. The Committee had fixation on technology of parking meters and generating revenue. PAC will keep this as a point on the agenda. Sara will communicate with Grant and Mauricio about better outlining goals.

- **TSP Hierarchy and Classification Discussion – David**

As a lead up to the TSP update, there has been discussion about how and where bike and freight classifications overlap and how to reconcile. PBOT Modal Coordinators and the chairs of all three modal advisory committees (PAC, BAC, and PFC) are engaged in a discussion to ground-truth the perception that these conflicts are frequent and unsolvable. There is not very much for pedestrians in this conversation, but PAC representatives will stay engaged to ensure that details such as making sure that turning radii to accommodate trucks do make pedestrian crossing distances longer will be acknowledged. In addition, PBOT staff want to engage modal committees on TSP discussions like hierarchy to see what info should be brought into the TSP. Arlene mentioned the need to challenge assumptions – e.g., no pedestrians on Marine Drive. Can we find balance between need for trucks to keep moving quickly and pedestrians needing to cross? Vancouver, BC has a hierarchy based on vulnerability with freight overlaid. Elizabeth will send presentation on the Vancouver policies for members to review.

- **Waterfront Park Access – Sara**

To address concern about reduced waterfront access during festivals, Sara and Roger Gellar are working with the group from Parks that is renegotiating Rose Festival contract to try to improve access. They are looking to close one lane of Naito open for peds and bikes during the festival. PAC says if an open lane cannot be negotiated, they should keep fences off the curb by a few feet because otherwise people will walk in the road.

- **Weston Awards – Attendees**

- **New Items**

- **David Aulwes would like to step down from chairing the PAC sometime soon.** Proposal to select nominating committee. Sara will look into bylaws/process.
- **Doug Klotz motions asking PBOT for evening crosswalk enforcement actions.** Don Baack seconds. Motion passed. Committee will send letter to Sharon White with suggested locations. Doug will start an online conversation to identify enforcement areas and considerations (marked/unmarked, lit/unlit, etc.)

### **7:30 – 8:30 ODOT Region 1 Active Transportation Needs Inventory (Jessica Horning, ODOT)**

ODOT is at the beginning of a process to identify gaps and deficiencies in their ped/bike network in order to identify priority needs. One goal in the Oregon Transportation Plan is to complete 100% of sidewalks and bike lanes on urban highways by 2030. The OTP was adopted in 2006 and network completeness was measured at 47% in 2007. “Urban highways” generally align with UGB areas, but do include some smaller, non-UGB areas. The original goal was to complete 2% of the network every year, but urban area keeps growing and as ODOT makes improvements, areas get incorporated and roads transferred to local jurisdiction. As a result, overall completeness has gone down and is currently at 42%.

At the same time, funding has been going down. ODOT now wants to make strategic decisions about use of funding to hit the most important locations. Other ODOT funding (such as for safety, pavements) has prioritization set up. This means projects are already identified for when money becomes available. No such system yet for ped/bike, which makes it difficult to quickly respond to funding opportunities. This needs inventory will be a first step toward establishing a priority list.

The project will be completed in two phases:

- Now – mid-January: Road show of ped/bike committees to shape project; do field data collection to know gaps and deficiencies in current system. This has been done this in urban areas on mainline highways like US-26, but not for connectors or frontage roads, which are as important to ped/bike connectivity.
- Mid-January – June: GIS analysis using evaluation criteria to prioritize projects. This will not result in a complete priority list, but ODOT will have a list of all the gaps/deficiencies and general types of funding for which they may be eligible (safety, economic development).

Gaps and deficiencies will be categorized:

- Tier 1: Gap, nothing there
- Tier 2: Deficiency, something there, but it doesn’t meet standards and/or needs.
- Tier 3: Deficiency, something there, meets minimum standards, but adopted plan says there should be something different/better.

#### **Q&A Discussion (name in parentheses is who initiated the discussion):**

(Roger) Project website does not include specific information. Gaps will probably be small and already included in TSPs of communities. Q1. Is this duplicating efforts? A1: ODOT is reviewing RTPs, TSPs, and corridor plans of all affected jurisdictions. Q2: Who is on the stakeholder committee? Recommend not having reps just from advocacy groups because they’re political and don’t know the local streets as well. A2: The stakeholder committee will mostly the people involved in the Active Transportation Plan.

(Anthony) Q1: Will LOS be part of the evaluation? A1: Will be looking at level of traffic stress, not LOS. Traffic stress gets at comfort (lane width, speed), but doesn’t require time-intensive data collection such as counts.

(Elizabeth) Q1: Does needs inventory include crossings? A1: No. ODOT has no adopted standard for placing crossings. In this project, will be focusing on crossing needs identified in TSPs and other local plans. Q2: But a lot of times local jurisdictions won’t identify a standard for an ODOT facility. A2: Hopefully get funding in next biennium to look at crossings and crossing standards. Q3: What about ROW? A3: It will be complicated

because if the gap is in the sidewalk, the city owns the ROW beyond the curb. First need to identify high-priority need areas and then determine the design that best meets that need.

(Don) Q1: Will work inform TSPs? Funding needs shouldn't be double-counted. A1: Just looking at ODOT facilities. Not asking jurisdictions right now for their identified projects on ODOT roads. Q2: Will project be assessing lighting at crossings? A2: Need to consider how much data can be collected between now and January? Collecting bike lane, sidewalk data first. If have time/money later, will look at crossings, lighting, etc.

(Anthony) Narrow sidewalks on busy roads are uncomfortable. When you're building new sidewalks (filling gaps), make sure they're wide enough, so you're not creating new deficiencies.

(Arlene) Make sure signage is friendly to non-English speakers by using symbols.

(Marianne) C1: Should have two Open Houses, not one: One on criteria and one on what's on the ground. People in neighborhoods will have the most say about gaps. R1: Will have maps for people to comment on/provide QA/QC. C2: Make sure people have enough time to review the project then. It's not fair to dump a lot of information on people and expect them to respond in a very short time.

(Rod) If you overlay Pedestrian Master Plan high-concern areas with ODOT facilities, you will see alignment. Crossings should be a higher priority than access to transit. C1: Low functioning sidewalks could be inexpensive to fix. For example on 82<sup>nd</sup> where car lots have moved fences and cars into ROW. ODOT should match areas where inexpensive and high-priority. R1: Most of these fences are actually on the property line.

(Sue) C1: Should include Portland Commission on Disability – Accessibility in the Built Environment subcommittee on the stakeholder committee. Should also come talk to them.

(Doug) C1: ODOT access management rules standards of crosswalks siting and the proximity of signals coming off off-ramps. These standards are not often pedestrian-friendly. R1: Access mgmt. rules are legislated. Rules apply to ODOT and cities. There will be no shortage of these issues coming up during this process. C2: Spacing applies to signals, not crosswalks. More of an ODOT standard than legislated rule.

(Roger) Q1: Will you be looking at adopting NACTO guidelines rather than getting design exceptions? A1: This project is more about geography than design standards. C1: Need to look at best practices for final criteria.

Follow-up: Invite Jessica back for meeting in January or February so PAC can provide more detailed feedback.

## **8:30 – 9:00 DRAFT Community-Initiated Trails Process (Sara Schooley, PBOT)**

### **Background**

SW neighborhoods have undeveloped ROW and poor pedestrian connectivity. If PBOT were to develop, it would be to road standards. In many of these areas, vehicle access isn't needed and/or we don't see redevelopment that would trigger access requirements happening soon, so a lot of these areas have become informal trails to increase the neighborhood's pedestrian connectivity.

One hiccup in the development of these informal trails is the concern adjacent property owners have over liability. If ROW is undeveloped, the adjacent property owner is responsible for maintenance. New state law (2011) – “recreational immunity” – transfers liability to city if the trail is developed in a formal partnership.

### **Current state**

SW Urban Trails plan was developed in 2000. It defines the purpose of trails and proposes a network. The “spaghetti map” shows all ROWs identified as potential connections. Map 3.1: “Proposed urban trails network” is the backbone of the trail network and the trails PBOT is more apt to push for. The plan did not address formal process for addressing trails that may not have public support. That is what is being developed right now.

### **Policy framework**

- Connectivity
- **Resident support** – Need to clarify expectations of what ROW will be used for. There should be a process for adjacent neighbors, nearby households (within ½ mile), and neighborhood association to give feedback about changes to ROW use. Looking at different combinations of support to qualify for trail. Looking for feedback on these criteria. Feedback from SWNI suggests not including adjacent neighbors. PBOT does a lot of this kind of support-measuring with block parties, speed humps.
- Trail design
- Permitting –
  - Encroachment permitting allows putting something in the ROW that wouldn't otherwise be there/wasn't planned. PBOT would provide for free.
  - Structural review, environmental permitting, unmapped floodway, etc: Environmental permitting standards will be maintained and thus far there is no interest in waiving those fees (not PBOT's purview). Could be taken up with commissioners.
  - Maintenance and enforcement agreement. Permitted group will do maintenance. Enforcement will be complaint-driven. Clean-up of trash, graffiti done by permitted group.
- Maintenance – group putting in the permit would be responsible for maintaining
- Funding – permitting group will also pay for the trail.

**Timeline:**

- November – February: Draft policy out for comment. Waiting for website to go live.
- February 2015: Approve could be Admin Rule or Council
- Will continue PAC discussion in December.

**Q&A Discussion (name in parentheses is who initiated the discussion):**

(Suzanne) C1: Helpful to know what to expect on the trail (slope, stairs, etc) at the beginning of the trail. R1: Good point. If project is not funded by public money, it doesn't need to meet ADA standards and people should know that before starting down a trail.

(Doug) This effort could help with Climate Action Plan, could get people walking, but will be held up by NIMBY neighbors. Q1: Why does the city need to get adjacent property owner support to do things in the public ROW? A1: We want to make sure people have opportunity to give feedback on *changes* to ROW that do not meet city standards.

(David) Q1: Are you trying to decide on an approval method? A1: No, we're developing a menu. There could be a number of ways to meet required support.

(Marianne) Q1: Will there be a fiscal assessment of how many staff hours this will require? A1: We don't currently have one, but could over the first "pilot" year.

(Arlene) Q1: How do we get adjacent property owners to maintain what they're responsible for? A1: With the permitting system, that responsibility will be shifted to the permitted group.

(Rod) Preference for third method is 60% support from adjacent neighbors instead of 50%. Getting support might depend on who is doing maintenance so that should be identified when seeking support. Q1: Does the city have any money to help with trail maintenance? A1: No. C1: It might be nice to provide a small amount of money to the groups who maintain.

(Roger) C1: Judge each trail application in context of adjacent system and its ability to increase connectivity. If there are no safe routes nearby, the trail should be priority. C2: If a group wants to build a trail, you should let them. Why prioritize? C3: Higher need should require less resident support.

(Don) C1: Need to put in removal of impediments in the existing ROW. The city needs to make sure property owners are not obstructing ROW with fences, etc. Property owners might be intentionally obstructing ROW to obscure the fact that public is allowed to walk here.

The website is live at [portlandoregon.gov\transportation\trails](http://portlandoregon.gov/transportation/trails)