



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 4: Bicycle Classification Descriptions and Other Bicycle Objectives

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
Thank you for incorporating all of the recommendations from Appendix B of the Portland Bicycle Plan for 2030 per Council Resolution #36763 as amendments to today's TSP. Question for staff, where are the policy, plan, and project recommendations from Appendix A of the Portland Bicycle Plan incorporated into the TSP or Comp Plan?	Gerik Kransky	PBP for 2030 recommendations on goals and policies and project are proposed in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan Recommended Draft in the "Goals and Policies" Chapters 8 & 9 and "List of Significant Projects". Identified Project have been incorporated either into the TSP Project List or will be within the Bicycle Network Completion, Safe Routes to School, or Neighborhood Greenways TSP Programs.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Thank you also for including Policy 6.7 Bicycle Classification Descriptions and objectives, this policy framework is essential to the success of our effort to achieve 25% of daily trips in the City of Portland by bicycle.	Gerik Kransky	Thanks.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p><b>The welcome inclusion of Bicycle Districts in Policy 6.7 D should not come at the exclusion of classification guidance for Off Street Paths. In TSP draft commentary it states, “... The PBP recommended eliminating the Off--Street Path classification in favor of classifying non--motorized bikeways based on the function of each route.”</b></p> <p><b>Questions for staff:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Can you please provide the policy language regarding off street trail classification and its location in the TSP and/or Comp Plan?</b></li> <li><b>2. Does the new policy still allow development of trails for transportation use?</b></li> <li><b>3. Are there any geographic locations in the city where trails are prohibited?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Gerik Kransky</p>	<p>The 2035 Comp Plan Update recommends eight “Trails” policies (Policies 8.50-8.57) and Public Trail Alignments map (Figure 8-2). TSP bicycle classification and pedestrian classification maps identify trails that are part of the citywide bikeway and pedestrian networks, focusing on trails that serve transportation purposes and calling them city bikeways (for bicycle classifications) and walkways and off-street paths (for pedestrian classifications), rather than trails. The detail for which bikeways are considered trails is found in the Portland Bicycle Plan, which refers to classified bikeways that are outside of the roadway as trails.</p> <p>Portland Parks &amp; Recreation identifies three trail types in its Recreational Trail Strategy (2006): regional trails, community connectors and local access trails. In the recreational trail strategy, trails are recognized as providing both transportation and recreational functions. Most of the trails in the Portland Bicycle Plan are shared with pedestrian and other non-motorized users, and are designated as Regional Trails in the Portland Parks &amp; Recreation system, which include both off-street (paved and natural surface) and on-street trails. Trails are typically multi-use, often shared by bicyclists, pedestrians and other non-motorized users, but should provide physical separation of activities when needed and possible. In some instances, off-street trail routes may go through parks, in which case they would be using multi-use park paths for a segment.</p>	<p>Email/ TEG facilitator</p>

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p><b>Regarding the amendment’s adoption of Policy 6.23 we have some concerns regarding Objective A:</b></p> <p><b>We suggest replacing the “Form” with the word “Complete” to read “Complete a citywide network of connected bikeways on streets including streets with low traffic speeds and low traffic volumes. Provide the highest degree of separation on busier streets to preserve access to common destinations. Accommodate cyclists of all ages and abilities.”</b></p> <p><b>While the new policy provides welcome context on the type of bicycle facilities to pursue, it lacks the word “complete” and should be amended to preserve policy direction to build a complete network of streets that accommodate safe bicycling.</b></p> <p><b>The balance of objectives included in this important amendment to the TSP is a fantastic policy framework for improving conditions of bicycling and BTA’s enthusiastic support.</b></p>	Gerik Kransky	During the development of the Portland Bicycle Plan for 2030, a subcommittee (Policy Working Group) developed the policy language that was adopted by Council. A change could be considered by the PSC. There has been no change to the Proposed Draft.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p><b>Section 4: Bicycle Classifications and Objectives, Page 9:</b></p> <p><b>6.23 Objective K states:</b>  <b>Maintain Portland's position as a national leader in the evaluation of bicycle improvements and ridership through on-going data collection and monitoring of changes to bicycling infrastructure and in riding behavior.</b></p> <p><b>This is good. However, if we're trying to be a national leader in something, shouldn't we aim higher? Should we seek not just measurement, but actual performance?</b></p> <p><b>Why don't we have a policy where we commit to being a national leader in the provision of bicycle infrastructure, and attainment of bicycle mode share?</b></p>	Garlynn Woodsong	6.23 Objective K is just about setting goals for evaluation/measurement. For the more "performance" objective, refer to Section 10: Performance Measures, where we reference the Bicycle Plan for 2030 and its associated mode share goals.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p><b>An overview about how the different elements of the Bicycle Plan for 2030 are incorporated into the TSP would be very helpful.</b></p>	Keith Liden	PBP for 2030 recommendations on goals and policies and project are proposed in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan Recommended Draft in the "Goals and Policies" Chapters 8 & 9 and "List of Significant Projects". Identified Project have been incorporated either into the TSP Project List or will be within the Bicycle Network Completion, Safe Routes to School, or Neighborhood Greenways TSP Programs.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p><b>I don't understand why on-street parking on local service bikeways "should not" be removed to provide bicycle lanes (p. 5). I can see why this generally would be inappropriate or unnecessary, but it seems very conceivable that this could be appropriate under specific circumstances. Perhaps this could be worded to indicate that on-street parking removal for bike lanes may be considered when other options are not available/feasible.</b></p>	Keith Liden	<p>The TSP provides guidance for tools to use for specific classifications. While we don't recommend removing on-street Parking on Local Service Bikeways (pg. 5, as to where the commenter is referring), we do identify parking removal as tool for Major City Bikeways and City Bikeways (pg. 3). Staff believes that the vehicle counts and speeds on local service bikeways will be as such that parking removal may be unnecessary to provide an adequate biking environment. Each situation should be evaluated individually.</p>	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p><b>I fully agree with 6.23 Objective L (p. 7) to remove barriers. This should include development review practices, lack of inter-bureau coordination, modification of onerous/excessive storm water requirements that inhibit active transportation improvements, etc.</b></p>	Keith Liden	Noted.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p><b>I also fully support 11.10 Objective T (p. 11) to utilize interim bicycle facility improvements.</b></p>	Keith Liden	Noted.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p><b>Metro staff supports "D. Bicycle Districts" addition.</b></p>	Metro	Noted.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p><b>Metro staff supports eliminating off-street paths as a functional classification; this is consistent with the RTP. However, recommend including reference to paths in the description of the other bicycle functional classification. It could be inferred from the current descriptions that paths are not a facility type.</b></p>	Metro	<p>We previously had a statement in both MCB and CB descriptions that called out pathways. We folded that into language about maintaining separation for bikes and peds "where conditions warrant" in order to bring neighborhood greenways under that separation umbrella. Also, refer to the 2035 Comp Plan Update eight "Trails" policies (Policies 8.50-8.57) and Public Trail Alignments map (Figure 8-2).</p>	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p><b>Off-street paths—we support eliminating them as a functional classification but there should still be some recognition of them in the plan</b></p>	Oct. TEG meeting	<p>The 2035 Comp Plan Update recommends eight "Trails" policies (Policies 8.50-8.57) and Public Trail Alignments map (Figure 8-2). TSP bicycle classification and pedestrian classification maps identify trails that are part of the citywide bikeway and pedestrian networks, focusing on trails that serve transportation purposes and calling them city bikeways (for bicycle classifications) and walkways and off-street paths (for pedestrian classifications), rather than trails. The detail for which bikeways are considered trails is found in the Portland Bicycle Plan, which refers to classified bikeways that are outside of the roadway as trails.</p>	Oct. TEG meeting notes.

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<b>How do you define the essential movement of all modes? You should reference your policy and not leave “essential” up to the interpretation of individual engineers.</b>	Oct. TEG meeting	Officers from the city’s bicycle, freight and pedestrian advisory committees met over the course of many months to hammer out final recommended language for these policies. That resulted in incorporation of the idea of performing careful analysis in order to consider the essential movements of all modes. All committees were satisfied with the current language. What is "essential" is and always has been a moving target. LOS A would have been considered necessary to accommodate the essential movement of autos in the 1950s. The intent is to now account for the essential movement of all modes (considering all of a street's classifications). Simply stating "essential" movement as the objective allows the city to more nimbly adapt to best engineering practice on what is considered “essential.”	Oct. TEG meeting notes.
<b>Be cautious about explicitly defining what protected bike lane actually means. Leave yourself flexibility.</b>	Oct. TEG meeting	Noted. There is likely a need to develop guidance about what is a PBL. For example, the MassDOT Separated Bike Lane Planning and Design Guide no longer defines the traditional cycle track as a protected/separated lane. They now refer to it as a "raised bike lane," which is a step down from protected/separated.	Oct. TEG meeting notes.
<b>We would like to see some recognition of Vision Zero in the classifications section.</b>	Oct. TEG meeting	We have integrated safety and the principles on Vision Zero into Section 1: Introduction of the TSP. Safety/Vision Zero principles are strengthened in the draft Street Design Classification descriptions	Oct. TEG meeting notes.
<b>Conflicts on the Central Eastside between bicycles and loading and unloading zones. Sometimes the only way loading can be accomplished is doing so in the middle of the street or bike lanes. Maybe bicycle districts could be used to encourage the city to employ treatments to warn cyclists they are entering a place where trucks parked in lanes should be expected.</b>	Oct. TEG meeting	We are not specifying design treatments within the TSP.	Oct. TEG meeting notes.

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<b>Anything you want to put in here to encourage expansion of bike share?</b>	Oct. TEG meeting	No change. Bicycle share was on the radar when the policy language was developed as part of the 2030 Portland Bicycle Plan (contained in Appendix B). Objective 6.23.J is already proposed in Section 4 to support bike-sharing programs.	Oct. TEG meeting notes.
<b>Very Complete. It is to be hoped that at some point we could have a similar level of importance for objectives for pedestrians.</b>	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Thanks.	Email
<b>5. General Comment: I think the TSP should state that for safety and comfort reasons on many of our bicycle routes it is desirable to develop ways to split the bicycle mode from the pedestrian mode.</b>	Don Baack	We do have language in "Major City Bikeways" to have separated facilities for bicycles and pedestrians, where conditions warrant and where practical. We could add this to the City Bikeway language and, if necessary, the Off-Street Trails language in the Comp Plan.	Email
<b>Requires one or more major changes. Free auto parking should be eliminated (other than loading zones) or severely restricted in Bicycle Districts.</b>	Online survey	On page 5, it states that "Auto-oriented development should be discouraged in Bicycle Districts." We try to limit specific direction in the TSP since each Bicycle District is different and would be evaluated individually. This might be a comment for the Parking section as well.	Online survey
<b>Existing bikeways are not safe. Roads are in a state of disrepair and sidewalks and warning devices are missing in many places. Also speed limits to cars need to be reduced where major bikeways cross busy streets with no signage or warnings.</b>	Online survey	Noted.	Online survey

**TEG + Public Feedback**

**Bicycle Districts — Although the districts that are proposed in the 2030 Bike Plan seem reasonable, it would be good to develop and spell out a process by which a business district or neighborhood could come forward and ask that their area become Bike District. Conversely, there should be a means to engage the people living and working in a proposed district in developing a district as such. Or is this in the Bicycle Master Plan?**

**Commenter**

Linda Nettekoven

**Staff Response**

Bicycle Districts are currently proposed per the PBP for 2030 recommendation. Additional bicycle districts may be designated - as the classification is further defined through implementation - with future planning efforts and updates to TSP. Bicycle Districts are intended to identify areas where there are multiple destinations across multiple roadways in a tightly defined geographic area: in short a main commercial district. The regional government has taken the ideas further, identifying as bicycle districts ("Pedestrian-bicycle districts" as urban centers and station communities). The region defines them as an "areas with a concentration of transit, commercial, cultural, educational, institutional and/or recreational destinations where bicycle travel is intended to be attractive, comfortable and safe." In Portland we created the idea of a bicycle district to acknowledge that in a dense commercial area only some of the streets will carry bicycle classifications (and thus good quality facilities) but that, because of the multiple destinations, all streets in such a district should be bicycle friendly. A bicycle district is not something that would be developed in an exclusively residential neighborhood. It is also not intended as a marketing tool and thus would not be something for which a commercial area could apply.

**Comment Source**

Email

**Currently I work in a small accounting firm in Hollywood district and the building is old and there is no bike parking except for the bike rack in front of the building on Sandy Blvd. There is no shower. Everyone in my office drives except me. Parking is ok because we located in a residential area with lots of single family housing. My coworkers don't see the need to bike or transit. The reason for me to bike is to get exercise and reduce carbon foot print.**

Patrick Mok

Noted. Refer to Section 14: Transportation & Parking Demand Management as well as Title 33.266.110 Minimum Required Parking Spaces (<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/53320>)

Email

**In my humble opinion, We should be focusing on infrastructure. Such as shower, lockers, secure bike parking, better bus services, neighborhood greenways etc. As a result, people like me would have an easier time not commuting by car.**

Patrick Mok

Noted. Refer to Section 14: Transportation & Parking Demand Management as well as Title 33.266.110 Minimum Required Parking Spaces (<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/53320>)

Email