



Transportation System Plan Expert Group

A Component of the Portland Comprehensive Plan Update



MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting Date: October 23, 2014

Time: 3:30 – 6:00 p.m.

Location: Rose Room, City Hall; Portland, OR

TEG Members Attending: Don Baack, Corky Collier, Marianne Fitzgerald, Sam Gollah, Cole Grisham, Eric Hesse, Phil Healy, Arlene Kimura, Tim Kurtz, Keith Liden, John Mermin, Linda Nettekoven, Lidwein Rahman, Phil Selinger, Chris Smith, Pia Welch, Garlynn Woodsong

TEG Members Absent: Matt Davis, Justin Douglas, Gerek Kransky, Allan Schmidt, Joe VanderVeer

Staff Attending: PBOT: Courtney Duke, Peter Hurley, Bob Hillier, Scott Boardman; BPS: Eric Engstrom; Facilitator: Jim Owens

Other Attendees: Catherine Ciarlo, CH2M Hill; Lake McTighe, Metro; David Hampsten; Roger Averbeck

Key Points and Outcomes

The TEG's meeting was focused on two key topics: comments on Proposed Draft Comprehensive Plan transportation goals and policies and a preliminary proposal for a Transportation Hierarchy. TEG members had numerous comments on draft transportation policies which will be consolidated and distributed for further discussion before they are forwarded to the Planning and Sustainability Commission. Members expressed serious concerns and discomfort with an initial draft transportation hierarchy, noting that it is missing a mechanism to resolve conflicts among modes and between the movement of people and the movement of goods be resolved. It was also felt that the hierarchy will not really work in areas or for persons for whom the single occupant vehicle is the only means of access. Information on the Vancouver and Washington DC hierarchies was requested. The TEG was also advised of the process and schedule for commenting on the TSP's candidate project list.

Welcome and Introductions (3:30 pm)

Description: Jim introduced Cole Grisham as a new member replacing Maryhelen Kincaid as the North Portland District Coalition representative. Following self-introductions, Jim Owens reviewed the approach and agenda for the meeting. He noted that the Two-Year Action Plan update item is being moved to the November agenda.

Pia Welch noted that the September 25 meeting summary, under Comprehensive Plan Update, failed to mention the lack of freight criteria and that freight routes are not on the map. There were no other comments on the meeting summary.

Jim and Courtney Duke reviewed the schedule for upcoming TEG meetings and public involvement activities. Courtney announced that five targeted outreach events are scheduled to begin in November.

She distributed information on the schedule for Planning and Sustainability Commission consideration of transportation elements in the Proposed Comprehensive Plan. She also announced that the TSP website has been updated and encouraged members to advise PBOT if information is missing or links are not working.

Don Baack noted that there is some confusion about how projects from the existing TSP (2007) are being integrated into the new project list and whether they are also represented on the MapApp. He asked:

- Will TEG scoping of projects be posted? A: No, that was a test exercise; staff will share how TEG and staff scoping compare.
- What is the focus of PBOT's targeted outreach? A: Groups identified in the Public Outreach Plan that have been involved in or have constituencies that could be affected by proposed transportation policies and projects.
- Will Venture Portland and Neighborhood Prosperity Initiative groups be included? A: Good suggestions.

Related Materials:

- September 25 meeting summary

Comprehensive Plan Update – TEG Comments (3:40 pm)

Presenters: Eric Engstrom, BPS, and Courtney Duke, PBOT

Description: Eric noted that copies of the Proposed Draft Comprehensive Plan and Feedback from the Networks PEG on the Working Draft, Part 1 (June 2013) had been provided at the August meeting. Also at the August meeting, Eric had identified the key elements of the Proposed Draft as Policies, Project list, Capital Systems Plan (CSP), and Plan Map. His September meeting PowerPoint presentation, 2035 Comprehensive Plan: TEG Policy Discussion, included identification of proposed policy changes from the 1980 Comprehensive and transportation policy changes from the Working Draft to the Proposed Draft. He noted that at Planning & Sustainability Commission (PSC) hearings to date there have been only three transportation-related comments. The November 4 hearing will focus on policies.

Jim reminded the group of the questions that had been distributed prior to the meeting to frame the discussion:

- How well does the transportation element respond to the Plan's Guiding Principles?
- How well does the Proposed Plan provide appropriate levels of transportation service overall?
- How well does the Proposed Plan reduce existing disparities in transportation infrastructure?
- How well does the transportation element put equity into practice?
- Have all transportation modes been adequately addressed?
- Does the Proposed Plan adequately define transportation system priorities and provide a process for resolving conflicts?
- Is it clear that not all modes can or need to be accommodated everywhere?
- Draft policies overly focused on mobility; does the Proposed Plan also adequately address network design and connectivity?
- Is the Proposed Plan clear on how a transportation hierarchy would be applied to different geographic areas and to different growth areas?
- Does the Proposed plan adequately address how the TSP and modal plans relate to the Comprehensive Plan and how conflicts will be resolved?

Comments and questions included:

- Even though it is supposed to be a policy document, language in the Proposed Draft is very wishy-washy, e.g. Policy 9.59 is “encourage” versus “require”. Verbs need to be stringer. A: The City Attorney’s Office has directed that such action verbs be eliminated where they would establish an untenable legal requirement.
- Mobility targets are needed as performance measures; those in other documents could be referenced.
- Proposed policies suggest the desire to accommodate all modes everywhere. What are the locations where this can be achieved?
- In addition to reducing VMT (Policy 9.5), the goal should be to reduce vehicle hours of delay.
- How is the policy direction from Pdx Airport Futures being integrated?
- Providing appropriate levels of transportation service overall should not be the target; rather, targets are needed that result in the appropriate levels of service for specific areas.
- A more expedited process is needed for updating area plans.
- The Proposed Plan assumes effective inter-bureau coordination; however, there is too often poor communication among bureaus.
- For the transportation hierarchy (Policy 9.6):
 - How is freight being integrated?
 - How does on-street and off-street parking fit in?
- It’s not clear what it means to enhance Greenways and Multi-Modal Freight Corridors.
- To successfully implement centers and corridors, a complete infrastructure will be needed. With over 13,000 waivers or exemptions granted, how can a complete infrastructure be achieved?
- Exemptions to the Transportation Hierarchy should require a public process.
- In a prosperous community, having greater VMT is a good goal that results from reducing the number of vehicles while enhancing the movement of goods.
- Waterways are not recognized as a transportation system element. A marine highway system should be designated.
- The Southwest Urban Trails Plan needs to be referenced.
- Vegetation management on streets without sidewalks is not addressed.
- Policy 8.77-Public Trails should be moved into the Transportation chapter.
- Extended shoulders should be accompanied by parking restrictions.
- Policy 9.38-Portland Heliport should be expanded to encourage other heliports.
- While it is clear that not all modes need to be accommodated on every street, bikes, pedestrians and transit users should be able to be accommodated.
- City Greenways should be protected; auto use should be restricted to local access.
- There is a dichotomy between the Proposed Comprehensive Plan and the TSP in terms of specificity. If not more specific, the Comprehensive Plan will not be meaningful. For example, Goal 9.G: Safety is more specific than its accompanying policies.
- Parking; where are the specific policies?
- The Working Draft Comprehensive Plan contained goals for everyone; it lacked specificity. This Proposed Draft Comprehensive Plan update needs to avoid being all motherhood and apple pie. It is easier to read but how policies will be implemented remains unclear.
- Bicycles being defined as vehicles raises a red flag.
- Safety: the vision should be zero crashes/zero fatalities.
- How will modal plans be integrated and guide policy? Are all modal plan projects included on the project list?

- Are all the goals intended to have equal footing?
- The Portland Freight Committee had submitted comments regarding the role of over-dimensional freight routes.
- Is the concept of using mass transit for freight movement being explored?
- How conflicts among modes will be resolved remains undefined.
- A tighter relationship is needed between zooming and the transportation system. Are we being smart about where we're locating facilities?
- A 25-year perspective on implementation is needed that includes sequencing, monitoring and adaptive management. Monitoring of cumulative impacts is needed.
- Policy 9.30: what is meant by "enhance"? Enhancing mobility may lead to greater safety problems.
- Trails need to be recognized as a transportation mode.
- Climate change may lead to rapid growth. How will we respond if growth outstrips the infrastructure?
- Congestion pricing is not addressed.
- The City needs to be aggressive about transit versus simply relying upon TriMet.
- The Proposed Plan needs more teeth.
- Bike system planning should be based on 5 miles or less, versus 3 miles.
- Safety: need to address emergency vehicle egress.
- Parking: what are the effects of restrictions that increase trips, e.g. at Pdx airport?
- More mathematical analysis is needed, including different formulas for outer versus inner neighborhoods.

Jim requested that TEG members submit additional comments, being as specific as possible, which he will then consolidate, synthesize and distribute to the group for review before they are forwarded to the Planning and Sustainability Commission. Eric noted that comments can be directly submitted through the Comprehensive plan website.

Related Materials:

- PowerPoint presentation -- 2035 Comprehensive Plan: TEG Policy Discussion
- PowerPoint presentation -- Transportation System Plan Presentation: Planning & Sustainability Commission Briefing
- Feedback from Networks PEG on Comprehensive Plan Working Draft, Part 1 (June 2013)
- Review Guide

Transportation Hierarchy (4:40 pm)

Presenter: Catherine Ciarlo, CH2M Hill

Description: Catherine presented an initial draft transportation hierarchy and policy and indicated that PBOT is gathering input from multiple sources. Differing opinions are being expressed within the bureau and out in the community. Comments included:

- A mechanism to resolve conflicts among modes is needed. In addition, how will conflicts between the movement of people and the movement of goods be resolved?
- The Transportation Hierarchy does not really work in areas or for persons for whom the single occupant vehicle is the only means of access. 80% of the population is at the bottom of the hierarchy.

- Where does parking fit into the hierarchy?
- Tolerance of delay needs to be a factor in the hierarchy.
- System completeness should be a metric.
- This is moving away from the regional policy for complete streets.
- What has been the experience in Vancouver and Washington, DC with application of a hierarchy? How are tradeoffs made?
- The focus should be on the network versus the individual street.
- The original hierarchy proposal had pedestrians on top and did not address parking.
- Overlapping uses of streets should be mapped.
- The proposed hierarchy makes transportation the end goal; land use is more important in determining goals for access.
- Need new metrics for measuring the interaction of transportation and land use.
- Need both complete streets and complete networks.

Staff agreed to distribute information on the Vancouver and Washington DC hierarchies. Responses to the issues and questions raised will be provided at a future TEG meeting.

Related Materials:

- PowerPoint presentation
- Proposed Policy schematic

Project Evaluation Process (5:20 pm)

Presenter: Peter Hurley, PBOT

Discussion: Peter reported on the results of the “test” project evaluation at the TEG’s September meeting. He indicated that access to destinations outside the City and evaluating a project’s contribution to completing the transportation network were identified as key shortcomings of the evaluation process. He distributed information on the process and schedule for commenting on the “candidate project list”.

Related Materials:

- PowerPoint presentation
- Handout on process and schedule for commenting on the candidate project list.

Public Comment (5:55 p.m.)

There was no additional public comment.

Adjourn (6:00 p.m.)

For more information, please contact either Courtney Duke, PBOT at 503-823-7265 or Courtney.duke@portlandoregon.gov or Jim Owens, Facilitator at 503-278-3452 or jim.owens@coganowens.com. The City of Portland will make reasonable accommodation for people with disabilities. Please notify us no fewer than five (5) business days prior to the event by phone 503-823-7700, by the City's TTY at 503-823-6868, or by the Oregon Relay Service at 1-800-735-2900.