

---

# Bicycle Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

11 OCTOBER 2016

## **BAC Members Present:**

Ian Stude, Rithy Khut, Betsy Platt, Christopher Achterman, Shayna Rehberg, Kirk Paulsen, Kieth Liden, Roger Averbeck

## **BAC Members Absent:**

Heather McCarey, Elliot Akwai-Scott, Dan Bower, Maria Erb, Reza Farhoodi, Jocelyn Gaudi, Evan Ross, Kari Schlosshauer

## **City Staff Present:**

Steve Szigethy, Roger Geller, Francesca Patriccolo, Taylor Phillips, Cage Bird, Lewis Wardrip

## **Guests:**

Jessica Horning, Matt Freitag, Mike Mason, Jeff Reardon, Lore Wintergreen, Arlene Kimura, Kim Marly, Jim Chasse, Nick Wirth, Emily Guise, Chris Eykamp, Nicholas Gross, Jonathan Maus, Marvin Rambo, Brian Lockwood

...

*The meeting convened at 18:00*

...

---

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

- City of Portland bicycle parking evaluation process is underway
- Women Transportation Seminar scholarship applications are due October 28. They have a high school, undergraduate, graduate, and community college and trade school scholarship for women interested in the transportation field. Google WTS Scholarship Portland to find more.

---

## **SW CAPITOL HIGHWAY: MULTNOMAH VILLAGE – WEST PDX**

Steve Szigethy presented on SW Capitol Highway from Garden Home to Taylors Ferry Road, which is undergoing a redesign process right now. There are a lot of topography challenges, with slopes up to 6%. This has been a 20+ year community priority, including capitol highway plan, SW Capitol Highway Plan Refinement Report, and Capitol Highway Corridor Stormwater Concept Study. This project is funded by Fixing Our Streets at \$3.3 million and stormwater charges for a total of approximately \$7 million

Many designs have been researched, from a 5' bike lane to separated bike lanes. 2016 plan with BES looked at lower cost approaches that didn't provide a complete street, but provided bidirectional bike lanes and at least a sidewalk on one side of the roadway.

Public outreach was conducted in the summer of 2016. This includes the SWNI Transportation Committee, a neighborhood walk, and a Capitol Highway Subcommittee (looking to meet again in Nov with Subcommittee)

Common Comments from outreach include;

- Sidewalk on one side is ok if safe crossings are provided
- East side sidewalk heavily favored
- Bike lanes: some wanted more separation, others wanted less
- MUP's not good unless delineated
- Keep it green except for visibility hazards
- Concerns about property impacts

- Excitement about fixing stormwater issues. – there is not currently a stormwater system here

#### Cross Section Concepts: Base Assumptions

- Going with continuous sidewalk on East Side
- Bike lanes in both directions
- Roadway will remain in current location (no rebuild)
- No major ROW acquisition
- Creative stormwater approaches

#### Cross Section N/S of Alice St.

- This is a ped/bike district
- North of Alice, propose 10 and 11' drive lanes, multi-use path on West side with skip striping and 4' separator between this and drive lane. One East side (downhill), buffered bike lane is recommended, with a sidewalk and planting strip.
- There are several feet of surplus on each side, but there are slopes and other constraints that require this to be left alone.
- South of Alice, West side will have bikes and peds separated by grade instead of the MUP.

#### Next Steps

- Now through 11/30/16: Comment period on cross sections
- PAC 10/18/16
- Capitol Hwy Subcommittee in November
- Fixing Our Streets Town Hall – Jan-Feb, 2017
  - o Concept design
- Design – 2017-2018
- Construction – 2019-2020 (will most likely last full 12 months)

#### Comments from BAC and others

**Comment** from Kirk Paulsen: Is skip striping for separating bikes and peds or will there be bidirectional travel by bikes? Why skip and not solid line?

**Answer:** Intended for southbound bikes, and bidirectional pedestrians. Skip striping is so that faster moving cyclists will be allowed to pass when going uphill.

**Comment** from Keith Liden: Good to have faster direction buffered bike lane. If it's necessary to shrink things, keep buffered bike lane when it is on the inside of a curve. This project should consider connecting with things at either end of the facility. Try not to leave bikes hanging when they leave the facility and connect to other roadways. Making it easy for people to get to the transit station would be ideal.

**Comment** from Roger Averbek: Success for MUP would be dependent on if there are safe crossings. Education may also be required. What is in the queue for intersections at 44<sup>th</sup> and 41<sup>st</sup>? What about Dolph?

**Answer:** After comment period on cross sections is done, we will work with design team and TriMet to look at bus stops and crossings and the more 3 dimensional aspects.

**Comment** from Kirk: Would stops be floating transit stops?

**Answer:** We are looking into this. Want to compare and contrast having bus stops on curb side vs putting bike lane behind the bus stop. Having sharp turns on the downhill section is a constraint.

**Comment:** How long is the segment?

**Answer:** Almost exactly 1 mile.

**Comment:** What is the total cost?

**Answer:** Looking at \$10-12 million

**Comment:** Dashed lines look like 2 way bicycle traffic on MUP. Some color or other delineation needs to happen.

**Answer:** We need to reinforce that with directional markings, circular bike and ped symbols, very frequently.

**Comment:** Is buffering just striping on the road?

**Answer:** Yes, for now. We want to look at putting in flex posts. We need to figure out stormwater solutions in parallel with this.

**Comment:** Flex posts would keep people from cutting corners, but they would probably stay up for about a week. Domes would make it uncomfortable for drivers to drive on and may be a better option.

---

## OUTER POWELL SE 122<sup>ND</sup> TO 136<sup>TH</sup> AVE

Jessica Horning, Mike Mason and Matt Freitag represented ODOT on this project. Jessica gave the presentation. The focus for today is the bike facility and safety for people biking, walking, and taking transit. ODOT decided to take a pause on the bike facility to work with PBOT after receiving many public comments. This would be the State's first protected bike facility on a highway. Funding is only for 122<sup>nd</sup> to 136<sup>th</sup> Avenues.

Common issues include

- Safety and Access
  - o ADA
  - o Sidewalks, ped crossings
  - o Improved bus stops
  - o Protected bike facilities
  - o Center turn lane
  - o Signal/intersection improvements
  - o Access management
- Green Streets
  - o Stormwater management (BES)
  - o Street Trees
- Efficient Project Delivery
  - o Minimize property and major utility impacts
  - o Maintain Federal environmental clearance
  - o Deliver project on schedule

We are currently just before 30% design, with construction slated to 2019.

Protected Bike Lane Option

- Currently looking at a 3-part strategy. Option for 122<sup>nd</sup> would be adding a bike signal and keeping the bike lane up to the curb instead of transitioning left of the right turn lane. We still do not have state traffic engineer approval for this but it is looking good.
- Curb separation between bike lane and travel lane is proposed.
- Small segment between 132<sup>nd</sup> and 136<sup>th</sup> could potentially be a pilot sidewalk level cycle track on the south side.
- It was decided that a mountable curb raised bike lane was too difficult to implement due to stormwater, topography, etc.
- Enhanced buffered bike lane with concrete was another option
- Sidewalk level cycle track was originally taken out of the running.

- PBOT/ODOT workshop – PBOT brought design for a sidewalk level cycle track, however there are north side conflicts
  - o Challenges include a water main conflict on the north side, ORS 366.215 freight route and emergency access requirements, stormwater spread and bus stop concerns, and multiple ODOT design exceptions might not be approved.
  - o PBOT cross section would have put swale right on top of the water main. They are not allowed to compact soils and create vibrations within several feet of the water main because it is very fragile. Adding a manhole and a pipe may not work either. BES does not plan on investigating this manhole for at least several years. It would require a bond to pay for the upgrade.
  - o Fitting street trees is going to be difficult with constrained ROW and large amount of driveways.
  - o Driveways would cause warping of the bike lane in order to keep cars from bottoming out.
  - o Mail delivery is currently a driving route and they do not want to change this.
  - o 20' horizontal clearance for freight at bus stops and ped crossing islands (there are 3) would mean the facility would have to drop to street level.
- Area between 132<sup>nd</sup> to 135th does not have the utility or garbage/mail conflicts. Cycle track design might be piloted on this section.
  - o ODOT is thinking about moving the TriMet stop, but that would be a huge deal because of large transit generators nearby and a pedestrian death several years ago.
- The rest of the corridor will have a buffered bike lane on each side. Bike lanes will be made out of concrete, there will be profiled striping and tuff curb product to the buffer area. Tuff curbs allow spacing for stormwater.

**Comment:** Is there a gaping standard for the Tuff curbs?

**Answer:** We are continuing to learn about this as we go through the design phase. This depends on maintenance, whether or not we want the candlesticks, minimum length for them to have a benefit, etc. Because this is a pilot project, we have the flexibility to test and figure out what works.

**Comment:** What's the lifespan of the tuff curbs?

**Answer:** They aren't glued down, they are on a spring. They are tested for 20,000 lbs of dead load. We have used these to separate lanes of traffic on highways and they have held up well.

**PBOT representative, Lewis Wardrip Traffic Engineer spoke**

Design goals

- Design and post roadway to 30 mph
- Construct a physically separated bikeway and maintain flat roadway
- Achieve all other design requirements of roadway

Design elements

- 30 mph
- Pedestrian hybrid beacons instead of RRFB
- Keep bikeway at sidewalk elevation at driveways
- Raised crosswalks and bike facilities at local streets
- Stripe through travel lanes at 10 ft

**Comment:** What's ADT on this segment?

**Answer:** 20,000

**Comment:** Right side bike lane will have a bike signal at intersections?

**Answer:** Yes

**Comment:** Maintenance with curb barriers would be difficult. How will garbage and debris get cleaned up with these barriers?

**Comment:** Sight distance with driveways is concerning, especially with street trees. Is there some way we can work with property owners to plant street trees closer to the property and away from the street?

**Comment:** Come up with a design that is reasonably consistent from one end to the other. Many people may get confused if the design changes several times.

**Comment:** What would happen with the driveways and could you talk about the crossing alternative?

**Answer:** Instead of a refuge island, there would be a red, HAWK signal. For driveways, the 4' area would take away the slope.

**Comment:** How does 4' area work with stormwater?

**Answer:** We didn't know about the pipe at the time. We are going to figure out solutions to this soon. Our right of way lines are set by the environmental clearance.

**Comment:** Has ODOT looked at speed at all?

**Answer:** We have been using 35 mph as the design and posted speed, which was what was called for in the conceptual design.

**Comment:** Do we need design exceptions for all alternatives?

**Answer:** Yes, for the proposed cross section.

**Comment:** Pleased that the bikeway is staying at the same elevation across all streets.

**Comment:** Wanting to echo maintenance concerns

**Answer:** There is discussion about this. Hopefully having a low vertical element will keep some of the debris out in the first time.

**Comment:** Would bike signal be accompanied with no right turn? Will there be a near side bike signal for people with poor eyesight?

**Answer:** Yes, and that is on the list of things to discuss with engineers.

**Comment:** Would there be enhanced markings across the driveways or minor intersections?

**Answer:** We have been assuming that bike lane striping would continue across driveways and we have been looking at skip stripe across 122<sup>nd</sup>. Just white, not green at this point.

**Comment:** For pilot segment, would those driveways remain level with the bike lane or would it be roller coaster effect there?

**Answer:** This depends on what happens at more than 30% design.

**Comment:** Drop to design speed of 30 mph if possible

**Comment:** There is a clear divide between ODOT's and PBOT's design standards and safety standards. The speed limit issue is a big one. There is a noticeable difference between 35 and 30 mph from the perspective of the bicyclist or pedestrian.

**Comment:** Shares concerns about curb separation design. Grade separation eliminates maintenance concern. Is there ability for ODOT to go back to BES and ask for flexibility on stormwater goals? Perhaps goals around stormwater treatment need to be met at a later date. The safety of the people is more important than the water.

**Comment:** Of course, BAC is here to see ODOT push the envelope further. Please tell us what we can tell you to get there. There is opportunity to improve what ODOT can achieve.

**Comment:** Unclear on the thoughts on driveways. How will we keep cars from sitting in the bike lane to wait for traffic?

**Answer:** This is not much of a concern with the buffered bike lane concept. Someone on a bike could also go around the car to the right (behind the car)

**Comment:** Earlier Jessica said this would be protected facility. Be aware that this is an important component

**Comment:** With Water Bureau replacing water main, why not ask for the whole section to be a pilot project facility. If the City has to upgrade the facility anyway, why not do full design on both sides?

**Comment:** Can stormwater facilities run to the south side?

**Comment:** Raised bike lane with road curbs is the best option in my opinion

**Comment:** Bike signalization MUST be a priority

**Comment:** Will HAWK's replace medians?

**Answer:** Yes

**Comment:** PBOT design seems safer.

**Comment:** This is also about economic development. We need to create a place that people want to live and invest in their businesses. This should be a place where people want to stop, not just drive through.

**Comment:** Lower the speed.

**Comment:** Powell Blvd Conceptual design plan expires in 2021. We don't want to do this again. It is imperative that we get a transportation package in Salem to fund this fully.

Next Steps include 30% design, construction in beginning of 2019. We need to have this issue figured out by the end of December.

Committee should come up with a formal response about the project. We will work this out over the coming weeks.

---

## COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Next scheduled meeting is on election day. Rithy suggested to move it to the 15<sup>th</sup>? and will send out an email to the committee to figure this out.

Getting enough people to be here who are full members to be ok with recruitment process would be good next month too.

East Portland membership recruitment has been ongoing. Subcommittee has met and scored applications. Because there are so many good applicants, do we want to take 2 or 3 on instead of just 1?

- We need to look at total membership of the committee, but we should be flexible to the fact that we are bringing many qualified members in.

Currently we are missing 3 full time members and at least 1 alternate.

Is it fair to choose new outside people over the alternates?

- We will do a new recruitment in 1 year.
- There are 7 alternates and 13 full members currently. We should only add 1 member and then use some of our alternates until next year when we can do a full recruitment.

What about getting 1 full member and the other 1 or 2 as alternates?

What is the duration of new members commitment?

- That is bylaw dependent. Maybe a full 3 years.

Rithy will double check the bylaws. We will for sure replace David.

Keith and Roger wrote a letter on SW Corridor. One letter to Metro and one to the City of Portland people to highlight that there are a couple of projects that City put forward for SW Corridor and highlight disappointment in those not being put on projects list. Public comment period is closed, so it can't wait

much longer. Committee members need to approve these letters by the end of the day tomorrow, 10/12/16.

SWIM is underway in terms of internal data collection. The plan is to begin public process at the beginning of the year. There will be a SAC. SWNI might be this committee, but Roger Averbeck has concerns about this. Reps from the Bike/Ped committees need to be part of this new committee. Keith is willing to represent BAC and Roger A. volunteers to represent the pedestrian committee.

...

*The meeting adjourned at 20:15*

...