

# Bicycle Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

14 FEBRUARY 2017

## **BAC Members Present:**

Rithy Khut, Christopher Achterman, Shayna Rehberg, Keith Liden, Roger Averbeck, Elliot Akwai-Scott, Reza Farhoodi, Evan Ross, Jocelyn Gaudi, Maria Erb,

## **BAC Members Absent:**

Ian Stude Heather McCarey, Betsy Platt, Dan Bower, Jim Chasse, Kirk Paulsen, Kari Schlosshauer

## **City Staff Present:**

Roger Geller, Belen Herrera, Suzanne Kahn, Mark Lear and Soshana Cohen, Cage Byrd

## **Guests:**

Jonathan Maus, Seth Alford, Alexis Biddle, Emily Guise, Jessica Engelman, Chris Eykamp, Jim Ashley-Walker, Luke Norman, Jaime Orrego, Joe Totten, Tim Davis

...

*The meeting convened at 18:00*

...

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

- 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue: Consultant Report - No identified funding sources and narrowing studying areas. Will be launching into list of improvements along the corridor and seeking feedback
- Offroad Cycling Master Plan committee process continues. Conversation about Forest Park will continue. Draft report to be publicly released 2/23/17. Recommendations for city council in June
- Gateway Green, the City of Portland won the Big Jump Sponsorship for People for Bikes to support bike ridership in improving infrastructure improvements

## **MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS**

Suzanne Kahn, Portland Bureau of Transportation's Maintenance Operations Group Manager since 2007, discussed the effects of reduced budget and staff (for five years running) and how she has maintained productivity. She focused specifically on how Maintenance Operations responds to snow events and discussed changes in practices around installation of the lines between the bicycle lane and the parking lane.

Maintenance Operations have a staff of 400 people, approximately one-half of all PBOT employees. They have a \$60 million dollar budget for maintenance, which is divided into three categories:

- Environmental Services (sewer and stormwater)
- Street preservation, signs, markings
- Sidewalk, structures (including bridges, stairways, tunnels, etc)
  - 1/3 of the budget is for pavement and markings

Comments from BAC and others

Comment: Organization chart is different from 6 months ago found online.

Answer: It has changed. November there was a reorganization. Not a big change. Maintenance Operations also installs new infrastructure. City is bound by provisions in ORS 279, which limits local agencies and defines that city staff can undertake capital projects that cost of \$125,000 or less. This absolute limit has not hanged in many years. Limits what we can do internally and what transportation puts out for bid.

Answer: Current cost to bring all Portland's streets to fair better condition would cost approximately \$141 million beyond what we're currently spending for the next 10 years. That's a 985% increase

beyond current spending. Right now we're spending about \$13 million for pavement, not including fixing potholes.

Comment: What would it take to "turn the ship" in a positive direction?

Answer: We've calculated what it would cost to hold steady and halt the deterioration. The accurate number I will get for you at a later time.

Comment: How do you prioritize repairs?

Answer: Based on pavement rating score and cost of what we can do as a preservation treatment. List gets whittled down; we then coordinate with planning to see where projects will occur to see if there are economies of scale for all PBOT work. We also ensure projects meet state requirements. We also evaluate projects through an equity lens. Only then do we finalize the list. We develop a three year rolling list to budget for.

Comment: What about emergency repairs?

Answer: We prioritize if one is on a heavily used street (arterial or collector) that may be in the middle of the street. Help us understand what are the priority routes.

Comment: Neighborhoods with major bike routes disabled by weather changes and leaves should have some attention.

Answer: Sweepers run at 3-5 miles per hour to pick up gravel and leaves. This is much slower than it takes for gravel to be placed down. The other issue with gravel is that it travels. We recycle it for the most part. There is a 6-8 weeks period in the fall to clean up leaves before they begin to compost on the street. This year we ran out of time before the storms came. We can do a better job where streets are heavily treed. Things like that so you can tell us so we can re-prioritize in what order we to clean.

Comment: Do we always have to use the huge trucks?

Answer: There are a few constraints; City Council directive to buy American but open to new equipment. Our current smaller sweeper doesn't hold very much. Street cleaning group has been reduced by 50% because of the general fund budget cut approved by council.

Comment: Is it possible to charge vehicles a fee based on their size and weight? Large vehicles sometime break curbs and large corporations need to pay their fair share. Also, smaller vehicles are ticketed for using a loading zone. Seems like the city should incentivize the use of smaller vehicles for delivery in the central city when that is possible.

Question: Has PBOT ever looked at leveraging volunteer power for clean up?

Comment: Re-visit opportunity idea. South West streets don't meet city standards. Should we put it back the way it is or make it better? Like to see in all projects a check list. Money available to do these small extra adds - Example, curb on Montgomery, which is in the TSP.

Answer: The longer term projects are preplanned and easier to do. With Maintenance projects there is a question of how we connect everyone interested in an improvements and the need to do public outreach.

## **LEGISLATIVE ISSUES**

Mark Lear, head of PBOT's legislative team, discussed the city's legislative agenda for transportation, the prospects for increased transportation funding, and how it all jibes with the Governor's Transportation Vision Plan.

- Legislative session must end by July 10th; Transportation Funding Package is city's highest priority & Jurisdictional Transfer talk at the legislative sessions
- Three key issues: seismic preparedness, congestion, and transit
- Joint Legislative Committee on Transportation Preservation and Modernization broken down into five committees
- Potential additional investments from ODOT from what cities already get
- Total \$5 billion need per year, but the package size being discussed will perhaps provide \$300 million.

- Hearing 2/15 for a bill, but have a policy position for Vision Zero, Automated Vehicles, and Transit Access to Youth

Comment: What are ODOT's estimates for safety, safe routes, public transit, outside the \$3.7 billion?

Answer: \$100 million per yr for pavement, \$100 to seismic is the scale. But we can get back to you the real numbers.

Comment: County level, low population. How do we address the rural and urban balance?

Answer: We follow these issues really closely. Funding improvements help with congestion and whole state. Proof in proposal generating revenue statewide to address the issue. Challenge is that we can't maintain every street and focus on prioritization language.

Comment: Discussion about reducing ODOT Share? With jurisdictional transfers the local jurisdictions will need money. Needs to be more conversation about that. Concern about congestion - we don't have the budget to address it through added capacity. Funding shortfall for maintenance. When will the city look into what they can actually afford to do?

Answer: Read through the Joint Committee Framework. Increasingly hard question to answer. Current 50-30-20 allocation (State-Counties-Cities) is the distribution we agreed to. That won't be addressed this legislative session but we will be raising this issue. It's been a major issue we've raised with the State. Careful how we go into these agreements on the discretionary revenues. Temporary \$.10 gas tax, progressive. City is clear that as we develop those successful projects the public will continue to support and be efficient with the resources.

Comment: List on requests for State Assistance - who prioritizes?

Answer: Work from joint legislative committee and subcommittee. TriMet is taking the lead on things like SW Corridor. Working with Metro on congestion relief and active transit improvements and work groups

Comment: Are they competing with each other or are they different categories?

Answer: They're different categories and types of discussion at the state legislature. Optimistic about the bill. Bigger discussion of what works. By March 15th we'll start to see specific recommendations from the work groups that will go back to the joint legislative committee.

Comment: Appalled that saving lives is 2nd priority vs maintenance, based on how the topics are ordered in your presentation. Also, is there support for giving local control for setting speed limits?

Answer: Not meant to be a prioritization. Community conversation. Make sure safety doesn't fall off. In general, we are supportive. Engaging with the office to work with the bill and work with speed. Margi Bradway is working more specifically on that.

Comment: Nontraditional process given the legislative project. Engage with this process and our priorities?

Response: We can do an email to include that information to be engaged and follow up with more recommendations. Shoshana can be an additional resource.

## **N GREELEY PROPOSAL**

Roger Geller discussed an opportunity to reconfigure N Greeley Avenue between Going Street Interchange and Interstate Avenue in conjunction with an upcoming paving project in spring, or early summer before there is a five-year moratorium on the street following the paving project.

- Proposing a cross-section that will push all travel lanes to the west to create a multi-use path on the eastern edge of the roadway
- Put in jersey barrier for the 3 quarter mile length to interstate that would be a multi-use pathway (10')
- two funding sources: heavy vehicle use tax (HVUT; freight committee approves) and capital set-aside for major maintenance projects (City Council decision in March)

- Currently can only afford the 10' multi-use path by using existing roadway width. Future widening could occur with more funding.

Comment: What's the transition to this?

Answer: At the signal at the south leg of Going St. Paving all the way North to Killingsworth.

Comment: I would prefer a more protected facility but some will still ride in the S bound travel lane.

Answer: Law is to use the bike facility if it's there. Existing pathway of Interstate to Greeley N bound.

Comment: What's the ownership on East side?

Answer: It's public right of way. Properties on top of the hill extend pretty far.

Comment: Homeless encampment along that path. But excited that would allow for most direct route into the Central City.

Comment: Suggest possible for a soft surface trail, under your purview? Transition at Going, thought of a left protected turn lane.

Answer: We can't do as part of this project but part of a future project. We could look at that.

Comment: No retaining walls needed. Maintenance responsible?

Answer: The cost is all in the jersey barriers. It's pretty flat. It's still the City's.

Comment: Width - 10' similar to Spring Water trail near Oaks Bottom? 700 cyclists a day, not heavy traffic.

Answer: We would expect cyclists traffic to increase.

Comment: 10' including shy distance to the wall. Why can't we do a road diet?

Answer: Right up to the wall, few areas we can go larger than 10'. We did look at the idea. We looked at the figures and the engineers didn't think one lane in each direction would accommodate existing capacity. Freight likes the separation of traffic and not losing capacity. Support from Committee for project.

#### COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Searching for a Vice Chair. Elliot is interested.

Universal Vote for Elliot as Vice Chair.

...

*The meeting adjourned at 20:05*

...