



PORTLAND BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION

1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185

Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

# TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public feedback on Section 2: TSP Objectives

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p><b>The Bicycle Transportation Alliance strongly supports Policy 6.13 Traffic Calming D., which will give much needed safety and priority to pedestrians and/or bicycle traffic</b></p> <p><b>The changes made to Policy 6.22 Pedestrian Transportation are concerning.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deleted: A. Promote walking as the mode of choice for short trips by giving priority to the completion of the pedestrian network that serves Pedestrian Districts, schools, neighborhood shopping, and parks.</li> <li>Replaced with: Comp Plan Policy 9.16 Design with nature. Promote street alignments and designs that respond to topography and natural features, when feasible, and protect streams, habitat, and native trees.</li> </ul> <p>While BTA certainly supports Comp Plan Policy 9.16 as an important element of street design it does not supersede or somehow replace the imperative that we promote walking for short trips by prioritizing completion of pedestrian networks. Both of these policy goals (TSP 6.22 &amp; Comp Plan 9.16) should be included in the final TSP/Comp Plan language.</p>	Gerik Kransky	Former TSP Objective 6.22.A is replaced by Policy 9.16 "Pedestrian transportation. Encourage walking as the most attractive mode of transportation for most short trips, within and to centers, corridors, and major destinations, and as a means of accessing transit."	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p><b>We are concerned with the following changes to Policy 11.10 Street Design and Right-of-Way Improvements:</b></p> <p><b>Deleted: G. Include sidewalks on both sides of all new street improvement projects, except where there are severe topographic or natural resource constraints or when consistent with the Pedestrian Design Guide.</b></p> <p><b>Policy direction requiring provision of ADA compliant sidewalks on both sides of all new street improvement projects should remain in the final TSP and Comp Plan. Question for staff, where is the ADA sidewalk requirement on new street improvement projects included in the current draft TSP?</b></p>	Gerik Kransky	The change implements Comp Plan Policy 8.44 and removes a barrier to new residential Street by Street standards that provide more flexibility to match the functions/context of the street and lower costs.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p><b>Section 2: TSP Objectives, Page 3:</b></p> <p><b>Concerning:</b>  <b>Policy 11.10, Street Design and Right-of-Way Improvements,</b>  <b>G: Include sidewalks on both sides of all new street improvement projects, except where there are severe topographic or natural resource constraints or when consistent with the Pedestrian Design Guide.</b></p> <p><b>This policy is proposed for strike-out, because it is "inconsistent with new Comp Plan Policy 8.44 to allow flexibility in design to reflect pattern area and contexts."</b></p> <p><b>That may be the case. However, I feel that something still needs to be said here to create a goal of pedestrian network completeness. I don't think that Comp Plan Policy 8.44 should be used as an excuse to punt on the whole issue of needing to provide sidewalks.</b></p>	Garlynn Woodsong	There are multiple "policies" and "objectives" for completing the pedestrian system and providing access...most notably "Policy 9.17 Pedestrian networks. Create more complete networks of pedestrian facilities, and improve the quality of the pedestrian environment." and objectives "6.22. B. Support walking to transit by giving priority to the completion of the pedestrian network.." "6.22. C. Improve the quality of the pedestrian environment by implementing pedestrian design guidelines to ensure that all construction in the right-of-way meets a pedestrian quality standard ...", but also Policies 9.16, 9.18	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p><b>6.23 Objective J - I would suggest connecting Bike-sharing to transit last-mile connections in addition to the uses mentioned.</b></p>	Chris Smith	Added "and to provide last-mile connections from transit" to the end of 6.23J	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p><b>6.26 Objective F - The Comp Plan has language suggesting consideration of parking for various types of bicycles. I think that variety of types should be reflected here as well.</b></p>	Chris Smith	Added "for a variety of bicycle types" to the end of 6.26.F	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<b>Some neighborhoods do not want sidewalks. If there is infill, the several dozen feet of sidewalk is not going to enhance the neighborhood that much.</b>	TEG member	No change. Objective 11.10.G is already proposed for amendment. This is consistent with findings of recent neighborhood street plans (Cully, Division-Midway and Tryon-Stephens) developed with the community to identify where traditional street improvements are needed most versus where there is greater design flexibility.	TEG Meeting Notes
<b>A plan is a plan and doesn't necessarily have to be achievable. Above a certain density, a street should have sidewalks. A transit street should always have sidewalks on both sides.</b>		Street by Street standards were adopted specifically for local-service traffic streets in low-density single family neighborhoods.	TEG Meeting Notes
<b>11.1. E. add Urban Trail Design (to accommodate pedestrians)</b>	Don Baack	Added "Portland Parks and Recreation Trail Design Guidelines" to 6.22.A	Email
<b>6.22.A Pedestrian Transportation change to read "...providing adequate number and quality of crossing opportunities ..."</b>	Don Baack	Add "spacing and quality of" to 6.22.A	Email
<b>11.9.D Change to read "within and between activity"</b>	Don Baack	Added "between" to 11.9.D	Email
<b>Needs minor updates. Had to choose something... Thank you for specifying that increasing traffic on streets of the same classification is an acceptable result of diversion for the benefit of vulnerable road users. We may get our older greenways to work well yet.</b>	Online survey	Yes	Online survey
<b>Complete as is.</b>	Online survey	n/a	Online survey
<b>P. 2 Policy 6.13 Traffic calming (commentary) ... as long as measures are taken to ensure resulting traffic volumes on nearby local streets are "acceptable". Acceptable to whom? This is likely to be a real hot button issue as diverters are added to protect greenway users. There needs to be mention of a standard here or it will be difficult to implement the policy in a fair, transparent manner.</b>	Linda Nettekoven	Council adopted guidance language in the Neighborhood Greenway Report (1000 cars per day, total). That level was selected because it reflects the maximum "ideal" conditions for operation of a streets that should be safe and comfortable to people of all ages and abilities. Should we wish to change that guidance, it will be much simpler to do it in the context of administrative rules or other Council action, than it will be to go and amend adopted policy.	Email

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p><b>P.3 Policy 6.13 D Here in the actual policy there is no reference to an acceptable level of diverted traffic. This represents a change in policy, which may be wise and necessary, but it feels like you're trying to sneak it in. You might also make reference to these changes occurring following appropriate public involvement. F Mention SAFE as well as "comfortable for bikes and peds"?</b></p>	Linda Nettekoven	This objective was approved by Council in 2010 as part of the adoption of the Portland Bicycle Plan for 2030. See comment above regarding addressing guidance/standards. I believe other parts of TSP address need for public process.	Email
<p><b>Policy 6.22 Pedestrian Districts — I know City Hall and environs is one, but there's no definition in the Glossary. What is the definition and what is the process for having an area designated as such? And being able to develop a special design district? Who would facilitate this process?</b></p>	Linda Nettekoven	Pedestrian District is defined within the Pedestrian Classification Descriptions and are designated on the adopted TSP Ped Map. The change to add "Centers and Corridors" was removed from the Proposed Draft.	Email
<p><b>Policy 6.28 Transportation Educ. Might be good to include the educ component of TDM, e.g., associated with new mixed use buildings and tenants/owners new to neighborhoods</b></p>	Linda Nettekoven	Staff will consider this as part of the implementation of the TDM program.	Email
<p><b>Random thought — does PBOT work with the New Portlanders program in ONI, IRCO and others working with new arrivals? And does PBOT work with DMV to give people active transportation info when they get a license?</b></p>	Linda Nettekoven	Our Smart Trips website has a "welcome page" ( <a href="http://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/54616">http://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/54616</a> ) which offers a range of free travel resources and a link to the Smart Trips order form. PBOT worked with New Portlanders at IRCO in the past. That class was cancelled at IRCO, and we haven't worked specifically with them since that time. There are no PBOT-specific active transportation materials from PBOT at the DMV. ODOT has their Oregon Bicycling Manual. Beginning this year we will be passing out SmartTrips order information to new movers through the PBOT Parking Permit process, and also inserting a similar opportunity into welcome packets mailed to new movers when they register to turn on their water through the Water Bureau.	Email

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p><b>The Bicycle Transportation Alliance strongly supports Policy 6.13 Traffic Calming D., which will give much needed safety and priority to pedestrians and/or bicycle traffic</b></p> <p><b>The changes made to Policy 6.22 Pedestrian Transportation are concerning.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deleted: A. Promote walking as the mode of choice for short trips by giving priority to the completion of the pedestrian network that serves Pedestrian Districts, schools, neighborhood shopping, and parks.</li> <li>• Replaced with: Comp Plan Policy 9.16 Design with nature. Promote street alignments and designs that respond to topography and natural features, when feasible, and protect streams, habitat, and native trees.</li> </ul> <p><b>While BTA certainly supports Comp Plan Policy 9.16 as an important element of street design it does not supersede or somehow replace the imperative that we promote walking for short trips by prioritizing completion of pedestrian networks. Both of these policy goals (TSP 6.22 &amp; Comp Plan 9.16) should be included in the final TSP/Comp Plan language.</b></p>	Gerik Kransky	Former TSP Objective 6.22.A is replaced by Policy 9.16 "Pedestrian transportation. Encourage walking as the most attractive mode of transportation for most short trips, within and to centers, corridors, and major destinations, and as a means of accessing transit."	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p><b>We are concerned with the following changes to Policy 11.10 Street Design and Right-of-Way Improvements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deleted: G. Include sidewalks on both sides of all new street improvement projects, except where there are severe topographic or natural resource constraints or when consistent with the Pedestrian Design Guide.</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy direction requiring provision of ADA compliant sidewalks on both sides of all new street improvement projects should remain in the final TSP and Comp Plan. Question for staff, where is the ADA sidewalk requirement on new street improvement projects included in the current draft TSP?</b></p>	Gerik Kransky	The change implements Comp Plan Policy 8.44 and removes a barrier to new residential Street by Street standards that provide more flexibility to match the functions/context of the street and lower costs.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p><b>Section 2: TSP Objectives, Page 3:</b></p> <p><b>Concerning:</b>  <b>Policy 11.10, Street Design and Right-of-Way Improvements,</b>  <b>G: Include sidewalks on both sides of all new street improvement projects, except where there are severe topographic or natural resource constraints or when consistent with the Pedestrian Design Guide.</b></p> <p><b>This policy is proposed for strike-out, because it is "inconsistent with new Comp Plan Policy 8.44 to allow flexibility in design to reflect pattern area and contexts."</b></p> <p><b>That may be the case. However, I feel that something still needs to be said here to create a goal of pedestrian network completeness. I don't think that Comp Plan Policy 8.44 should be used as an excuse to punt on the whole issue of needing to provide sidewalks.</b></p>	<p>Garlynn Woodsong</p>	<p>There are multiple "policies" and "objectives" for completing the pedestrian system and providing access...most notably "Policy 9.17 Pedestrian networks. Create more complete networks of pedestrian facilities, and improve the quality of the pedestrian environment." and objectives "6.22. B. Support walking to transit by giving priority to the completion of the pedestrian network." "6.22. C. Improve the quality of the pedestrian environment by implementing pedestrian design guidelines to ensure that all construction in the right-of-way meets a pedestrian quality standard ...", but also Policies 9.16, 9.18</p>	<p>Email/ TEG facilitator</p>