
CITY OF PORTLAND
PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE



NOTES

Tuesday, December 16, 2014

7:00 – 9:00 PM

Portland Building, 1120 SW 5th Ave, 8th 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
Alexis Kelso
Judith Gray
Courtney Duke

Others:

None

7:05 – 7:15 Introductions, Hot Topics, Points of Interest, Successes

- **Metro design challenge advisory group – Elizabeth**
Completed; no updates.
- **Parking Advisory Committee – Rod**
No meetings since last time; next meeting in Jan.
- **Traffic Calming by Good Samaritan – Sue**

PAC will also discuss traffic calming in February, but Sue can probably handle this through 823-SAFE. 823-SAFE is a number to call if you see something on the road you think is unsafe (such as signs, markings), and they will send out a traffic investigator to assess the situation. Can also email safe@portlandoregon.gov. They currently have a backlog, so it might take a while for the assessment to be completed.

- **Uber – Sue**

Sue is working with city attorney on testimony for December 23 hearing. Let her know if you have issues with Uber.

- **Trails Process – Sara**

Feedback on draft process will be received through February. Then comments will be incorporated into an update and released for another review. Hope to pilot the program mid-late 2015. More information can be found at portlandoregon.gov/transportation/trails or by emailing trails@portlandoregon.gov

- **SW Corridor – Roger**

A shift in direction was approved by steering committee: 18 more months of staff work and engagement prior to starting EIR in order to narrow the package of transportation improvements including HCT. David adds that the reason for the change is to allow communities to express their preferences for alternatives before environmental work begins. Another reason for this is to provide info to Tigard and Tualatin about alternatives so they know what to expect and can have enough information for it to go to the ballot. Roger says better information needs to be given to the community for them to be able to weigh in on design options.

- **Division-Powell – Arlene**

Alignment has mostly been selected; they are now locating stations. Arlene has concerns about the design's capacity for accommodating pedestrians, especially at intersections. David clarifies that they are not picking station locations just yet because they still need to plan service and are exploring alternatives of mixed traffic, fully separated, transit priority signalization. They have decided on the "inner Powell, outer Division" alignment, but haven't decided where the route will connect the two.

- **Budget Advisory Committee – Marianne**

PBOT is anticipating \$12M in fed grants until 2020 for CIP. Keep this in mind for prioritizing projects. The mayor is directing bureaus to start working on performance measures. One of the mayor's priorities is healthy, connected communities, but PBOT's measures/priorities don't include measuring sidewalks which are key to healthy, connected communities. PBOT should more carefully select its performance measures to align with the Mayor's priorities. Rod adds that ped/bike/transit measures shouldn't be lumped together.

7:15 – 7:40 Chair Nominations and Filling Positions

Nominees for Chair and vacant member positions

David's last meeting as chair will be Jan 20. Charter procedure says vice chair becomes chair, but Doug would like to stay in the vice chair position. Nominations for chair: Roger (accepts), Elizabeth (declines), Rebecca (accepts).

Charter says up to 15 members and 8 alternates. Currently have four member positions open. David moves to nominate Chase, Scott, and Anthony to full members. Roger seconds. Anthony recommends Boris. Sara recommends Eve, but says she should check with her to make sure it aligns with her other commitments.

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

(Roger) Remember criteria used to evaluate original applications and consider equity, geographic issues.

(Rod) Wants to know the rules first and suggests that notice of open positions needs to go in the notes and emailed out so everyone who wants to has a chance to voice an opinion; requests a link to bylaws to be included.

(Roger) Q1: Is there a term limitation for officers? A1: There is, but they can be reset. C1: Chair needs to have strong vice chair to depend upon. Q2: How much work do officers do outside PAC meetings? (David) A2: If someone is interested in a topic, it is expected they write the letter/lead the effort. Sara and Doug are good at proposing agenda items. Occasionally chair needs to attend other meetings. But it's not too much work outside the PAC meetings. Q3: To what extent are officers responsible for setting agenda? (Sara) A3: About half the agenda items are requests from outside asking to present; the other half are PAC member-generated. Sara uses David and Doug as sounding board for what is PAC appropriate and then arranges for guests to come.

Don motions that the committee:

- Write up what the task of chair is.
- Request resume for full members (Have for alternates; Sara can distribute, but Roger doesn't want his resume distributed to general public and would rather write a statement.)
- Request resume of potential alternates.

Decisions:

- Postpone votes for chair and full members tonight and do blind ballot in January (this aligns with bylaws)
- Write up a "job description" for chair position.
- Nominees for chair to write a paragraph-long statement.
- Members to review bylaws (optional).

7:40 – 8:30 Transportation Classification Discussion (PBOT Modal Coordinators, Rod Merrick)

Summary from Sara: PAC has a unique position in this discussion, because this issue is mostly perceived issues with bike/freight classification overlaps. The ultimate goal is for all modal committees to work together and jointly present a recommendation to staff so that staff do not have to "pick" between modal committee recommendations.

Presentation:

Traffic classifications specify the roles some streets have for specific modes. Portland has classifications for freight, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle. Bicycle classifications are distinguished between "city bikeways" and

“major city bikeways”. This distinction is new to the Bicycle Plan for 2030 which was adopted by resolution in 2010.

In 2006, the freight plan was adopted and it was put into the 2007 TSP update.

The current conversation is about how to add the two bikeway classifications to the TSP, with special attention to where bikeways overlap freight priority streets. The major takeaway from the presentation is that there is not a lot of conflict between major city bikeways and freight. Some streets, like 82nd and Powell, are considered major city bikeways by ODOT, so that is some of the overlap, but ODOT designates all state highways as “bikeways,” so the updated classifications also work to align with state policy. Please read the memo for more background (it was sent with the agenda for this meeting and there’s a link on the PAC website – “Classification Memo.” The final goal for the modal committees is to present the TSP team with a joint letter on what to do regarding their proposal to:

- Adopt major city bikeways into TSP
- Adopt policy language that goes along with the major city bikeways classification
- Modify policy language in support of existing classification of city bikeways

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

- (Sue) Q1: What does all this mean for pedestrians? A1: Part of the recommendations the PAC could put forward is to consider pedestrian classifications with particular attention paid to crossings. Also, PMP update should be next so conversation can occur about ped classifications and get adopted into TSP. Q2: Every street needs to be ped street, so why identify particular ped streets? It should all be ped first like in Washington, D.C. There is a zero sum game when you have limited ROW, and the first to be cut is pedestrian facilities. A2: The rub in this policy is where bike and freight share the space; peds get their own space as sidewalks. When new development goes in, sidewalks will too.
- (Rod) C1: PAC didn’t get to talk about the Vancouver model. Suggestion is that this does need serious discussion regarding design specifics, not just a high-level policy discussion. We should have some modeling with expected major city bikeway facilities so we know what happens if we actually try to implement the proposed policy. For example, cycle tracks and high transit use streets can be a conflict for pedestrians boarding/alighting transit. R1: In a policy discussion, a lot of times you can’t have design discussion.
- (Don) C1: Portland needs an overlay for urban trails. An urban trail classification would allow 20 mph speed limit. These are streets without sidewalks. R1: This is for PMP update. C2: It should be put in the TSP now since they are already identified; no need to wait for a PMP update.
- (Scott) C1: This is a bike proposal. There’s nothing directly in this for peds, but the big picture is that the PAC should provide solidarity BAC as active transportation partners to the BAC will support PAC on their future efforts.
- (Roger) Q1: Where is the new language for regular city bikeways? A1: On page three in the memo. Q2: Has anyone proposed changes to language on city walkways? A2: No. C1: There is a distinction between using development fees and providing PBOT/city funding. Different types of funding can result in different types of facilities being implemented even on the same street. Things get value-engineered out and policy is not always followed.

- (Marianne) C1: Prefers the D.C. model over Vancouver model. Portland doesn't follow policies; pedestrians should have priority when a bikeway is proposed, otherwise they just end up with a shoulder to walk on.
- (Doug) C1: Turn radii is important to ped crossings. Large trucks shouldn't be allowed in the city. The problem with classifications is that you should be able to get to your destinations by any mode you use, not stuck on some side road as a second class citizen.
- (Arlene) C1: There is an issue is if you have development and the developer says there is no major cycling. They don't have to build to the standards. Just like they narrow sidewalks. What's the point of having a policy if it's not implemented? Every street is a pedestrian street. Every street should have six feet of dedicated space.
- (Anthony) C1: Though this is largely an issue about bikes and freight, motions that PAC send a letter about important considerations regarding pedestrians in this classification.
 - Don seconds, 6 in favor.
 - Elizabeth, Marianne, Don, and Sara to work on letter.
- (Elizabeth) C1: This really matters because of how we set policies. Not comfortable with bikes getting priority over pedestrians on major city bikeways. R1: this is actually a very small thing. R2: PAC can craft language that supports change, but also expresses concerns.
- (Rod) C1: Policy needs modeling.
- (Sara) C1: Roger Geller will be presenting more about this at TEG on Thursday, so go to that if you're very interested.

Decisions:

Elizabeth, Marianne, Don, and Sara to work on letter about pedestrian considerations for the implementation of these policies.

8:30 – 9:00 TSP Update – Prioritization Criteria, Project List, and Comprehensive Plan Update

- Overview of where we've been/what we've done.
 - The Comp Plan is being updated (process been going on for past 8 years because of the Portland Plan)
 - TSP is a component of the Comp Plan, but there are also components of the TSP outside the Comp Plan.
- Why needed? Anticipated growth not accommodated on roadway with current mode split.
- Seven outcomes from various plans worked into project prioritization
- Currently working on: goals and policies, project list, finance plan, street classifications, and master street plans.
- Later: modal plan, refinement plans, etc.
- Policy changes: Mostly in Chapter 9, but also others. One size does not fit all approach throughout the whole document.
 - This draft has been out since June. Outreach all fall. Now in hearings about policies
- Financial plan: \$1.7B with our streets. Candidate list is 2-3x more than projected revenue.

- Working harder on prioritized list. Candidate has been out since October, revised will be out in January.
- Project evaluation: Created internally, vetted by TEG, modified as comments come in. GIS based evaluation.
- More robust programs than in the past. More ongoing funding for programs.
- Current focus on February 24 deliverables and outreach. Then working on next steps to get things approved by December.
- Ask from the PAC today: Prepare testimony for 2/24 PSC hearing. Testimony can be about anything, but focus of the meeting on prioritized list and financial plan. Projects are on the Map App right now, but Courtney suggests waiting for new list on Jan 9 or prioritized list on Jan 30 to draft PAC letter (individual comments welcome at any time). Courtney will come back in Feb, possibly in Jan for another presentation.

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

- (David) C1: Suggest setting up a separate meeting or PAC subcommittee to go over projects and policies. R1: If you make comments now on the Map App, those comments will feed into the prioritized list. C2: The hard thing to understand is the difference between the whole list and the prioritized list, tiers and project/program buckets. Q2: Is there interest in setting up a committee to submit testimony as a PAC? R2: The prioritized list does not mean the “top” project gets constructed. The list is related to the anticipated sources of revenue in 20 years, but there will always be more projects than money. The list is needed to meet state and fed regulations for money, air quality, etc. The purpose of this current process is to have a transparent, consistent prioritization process that is as objective as possible. The end goal is a total rational sum of projects that meet revenue projections, and then be ready for funding. This is not the CIP list.
- (Sue) Q1: Is this list based on Our Streets passing? A1: No, but if it doesn’t pass the constrained list gets smaller.
- (Roger) Q1: Request for more info on Jan 9 list. What is it? How are public meetings in Jan going to inform the ranked list? A1: The meetings are to let people know about the process and how to comment. Comments will be incorporated as they can be and reported to PSC. The list has to go to Metro for modeling to make sure projects meet standards. Expectations are that after Jan 9 there will be a refinement of the priority list but it won’t be so substantial that it will affect modeling. Jan 30 list is a new list, but comments will be received until March 13.
- (Marianne) C1: The prioritization criteria are not transparent. R1: This has been to the TEG. C2: I don’t know what is being proposed (i.e. how are criteria defined?). How have criteria changed based on comments received? What are the centers and corridors? They are not defined. Want more info about upcoming deadlines in next phases.
- (Rod) C1: It would be helpful to know what the comments are on the Map App. You shouldn’t have to go one by one through the projects. What are the emerging themes? Which projects have generated many comments? PAC is supposed to be representing constituents, not just own opinions. Maybe we need to push back on the timeline if it doesn’t make sense. R1: Flexibility of the timeline is welcome when it is possible.

Decisions:

- Want to learn more about the criteria and timeline in future meetings.
- Subcommittee meeting at 6:00 before Jan 20 PAC meeting.