

**50s Bikeway Project**  
**Burnside to Glisan Traffic Calming Discussion**  
**April 26, 2011**

**PBOT staff:** Rich Newlands, Sarah Figliozzi, Jenny Tower, Peter Koonce

To start off, Rich asked for a raise of hands to find out where people lived:

- Most lived along the project area, Half and half between north and south Portland
- 60% in the audience had heard of the project previously

Rich presented the overview and schedule of the project.

Peter presented the signalization situation and concerns, and showed some potential solutions.

**Comment:** Attendee mentioned that there are no stop signs on 53rd, as an additional contributor to cut through vehicle traffic.

**A:** As a general response, in standard bikeway design we will generally only install stop signs for the cross streets so as to not create more delays for cyclists along the route.

**Q:** (In response to traffic count data) When did you do those counts? Is there a comparison to past data to see if there is an increase in traffic?

**A:** Counts were conducted during the last two months. We have some past data, but it can not compare to the extent of these current counts.

**Q:** Do you know the Burnside to Couch width?

**A:** **Street width** matches the streets south of Burnside, with a 24' curb to curb.

**Comment:** An audience member praised the semi diverter when it came up in the presentation. He felt this would be an excellent solution.

**Q:** In the example photos provided for semi diverters and snake diverters, are any of those streets as narrow as 53rd? Will the width be a problem?

**A:** In the snake diverter option, the width of 53<sup>rd</sup> isn't a issue, in that case the width on Burnside matters the most. The semi diverter isn't likely to have issues with the street width either.

**Q:** (In reference to the semi-diverter) This would only affect traffic on one side, correct?

**A:** Yes, only one side is affected, controlling only one direction of travel.

**Comment:** In response to the pinch point design option, an audience member mentioned that the street is already very narrow, particularly south of Couch. Today's conditions have a pinch point like effect, with limited success.

**Q:** 53rd isn't an arterial through street, correct?

**A:** Correct. Except for bicycles, 53rd is a local street only.

**Q:** So we're concerned about diverting traffic onto other neighborhood streets, but in reality, we're just giving them back the traffic we've been taking.

**A:** In city policy, we're willing to accept some diversion, but not much, onto the other neighborhood streets.

**Q:** Can you tell me what the differences in turning movements between the two diversion options?

**A:** With a semi diverter, right turns are prohibited onto 53rd, but permitted with a median. The median would prevent left turns off 53<sup>rd</sup>(from both N and S directions), potentially making the crossing of Burnside easier for people biking or walking.

**Q:** On your evaluation criteria, diversion was a negative, but it's ok if it's diverted right? Isn't that what we want?

**A:** We would like to bring traffic volumes down to make a comfortable bikeway however we don't want to just move the problem around the neighborhood.

**Q:** But this is about making 53<sup>rd</sup> safe for bicyclists, so it is a priority?

**A:** Yes, this is serving a regional purpose.

**Q:** If a snake median permits right turns off Burnside, how is it safer for crossing?

**A:** We block the left turns, which tend to be riskier maneuvers.

**Q:** What about stop signs? Can we use those to make route less desirable for cars?

**A:** No, per our bikeway design preferences we would not add stop signs along 53<sup>rd</sup>. Rather we would add stop signs for the cross traffic.

**Q:** If traffic is snaking through the neighborhood because of diversion, you may need more stop signs to manage their movement.

**A:** That is a good point. We've only looked at the bikeway signage so far, but we'll look at the neighborhood as a whole.

**Q:** There will be a signal along with the diverter?

**A:** On all alternatives, there will be a signal at E Burnside to facilitate bike and pedestrian crossings.

**Q:** Have you talked with the hospital about what they want?

**A:** Yes. They are working on a master planning process and we are working with them to understand their needs.

**Q:** The signal, what would that be like.

**A:** It could be similar to what we have at 39th and Clinton. This is called a full signal with diversion treatments that restricts traffic into the neighborhoods on either side of SE 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue (SE Cesar Chavez Blvd).

**Q:** From CAC member: I was under the impression that there would be a HAWK signal, but you're recommending a diverted full signal here. Why the difference? If HAWK is better for bikes, shouldn't it be preferred?

**A:** We are responding in part to the FHWA discouragement of HAWK signals at intersections. The MUTCD language states that a Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (formerly referred to as a HAWK signal), should not be installed at intersections. For a full signal, we would do bicycle priority detection and signalization.

*It was noted that the signal type is still under internal discussions.*

Rich took a straw poll: Which of these alternatives might have the greatest community support? Raise hands for each option you are in support of.

Option A, Snake Median: 4

Option B, Semi Diverters at E Burnside: 14

Option D, Semi Diverter at Glisan: 0

Rich asked the community for their concerns about Option B. What should we keep an eye out for when designing and implementing a partial diversion solution?

- We would want to see more stop signs on 55th to discourage cut through diversion there.

*Note from the PBOT engineer in attendance: because the intersections jog across 55th, we can't install stop signs along 55th with this configuration.*

- I like Option A because omitting left turns is a little safer for bikes.
- I'm concerned traffic would cut through on 55th and Everett to get to the signal at 53rd.
- **Q:** Could we put a sign up that says "through traffic, use ..."  
**A:** There will be a 'Do not Enter, Except for bikes' sign
- Be careful about cut through traffic through the parking lot of the restaurant.

Rich asked how confident the community is of this concept. Is this something you would like to see in the final plan? Will this single meeting is enough before we make a final plan?

*General consensus in the audience was that it was.*

**Q:** Has it been determined that Burnside is wide enough for a snake diverter?

**A:** Yes it is

**Q:** How will you do bicycle detection?

**A:** There will be a loop detector in the ground. This would be supported with a bicycle signal push button at the intersection.

**Q:** What about audible or visual cue that a bike has been detected?

**A:** There are no standards for that, but if it is something the community wants we can explore options for inclusion of this into the design.

**Q:** Are you doing anything to change the signal for 53rd and Glisan?

**A:** No signal changes are planned, except for bicycle detection which could be added to improve conditions for cyclists.

**Q:** If the bicycle is detected and given the signal, and many bikes come through, wouldn't Burnside get congested?

**A:** Using the example at E 41<sup>st</sup>/Burnside, we set up a delay between cycles, so that it doesn't contribute to congestion. There is a balance between the bicycle and pedestrian movements and the vehicles on Burnside..

Rich confirmed that we have a good idea of what the neighborhood wants. PBOT will move forward with alternative B, including sending the recommendation to the Citizen Advisory Committee as well as the North Tabor Neighborhood Association.

**Meeting concluded 7:35**