

Bicycle Advisory Committee Meeting

Lovejoy Room, City Hall
May 9th, 2017 6 pm to 8 pm

BAC Members Present:

Rithy Khut (Chair), Elliot Akwai-Scott (Vice-Chair), Christopher Achterman, Shayna Rehberg, Keith Liden, Reza Farhoodi, Jim Chasse

BAC Members Not Present:

Ian Stude, Roger Averbeck, Dan Bower, Maria Erb, Jocelyn Gaudi, Kirk Paulsen, Betsy Platt, Evan Ross

PBOT Staff

Roger Geller, Sarah Figliozzi, Liz Hormann, Rich Eisenhauer, Daniel Soebbing

Guests

Chris Eykamp, Chris Smith, Luke Norman, Jonathan Maus, M. Rambo

Introductions/Announcements

6:00pm

Rithy Khut: Portland Art Museum ordinance has been pulled back. Commissioner Saltzman has had a meeting with PAM. Either try to find support on Council, amend the proposal, or redesign the building. What can we continue to do to encourage a design change? Don't have a good read on any councilors about where they are on the proposal.

Elliot Akwai-Scott: At Council hearing there were 22 members of public in opposition to ordinance. 4 were in support. PSC had requested to have the topic on their April meeting, but didn't discuss because Commissioner Saltzman retracted the proposal. Going to recommend that proposal goes before the PSC before Council votes on the proposal. Will update everyone when they send a letter.

Rithy: Until we hear new developments the proposal is on hiatus. We could send a lot of emails, and hopefully they will read them.

Elliot: Wants the opportunity to participate in the autonomous vehicles debate.

Chris (guest): AV language is coming out in the coming TSP update. Long term policy is going through the TSP, but administrative rules don't require any public process.

Elliot: Reza will be rep for Broadway corridor. Elliot will be rep for 82nd project.

Keith: Do we have a list of which projects made it onto the TSP, and which didn't?

Roger: There were specific lists to nominate for different funding sources. RTP is the regional complement to the TSP.

Roger will provide the list of recommendations that the committee made.

Bicycle Parking Code Update

6:10

Sarah Figliozzi: We are here at the request of the stakeholder advisory committee. Came to this group 2 years ago to announce that the project is going to happen. Making slow progress.

- The SAC has met 5 times.
 - Membership comes from BAC, property developers, property management
 - Technical advisory and stakeholder advisory
- Mode split goals in the Climate Action Plan and Comp Plan influence the amount of bike parking that is going to be required.
- Current code was written in 1996.
- Bike Mode share has quadrupled since 1996.
- Code triggers: New construction and renovations over a specific dollar value.
- Rule does not apply to City owned street bike racks.
- In 2010, the long term parking bike requirement was increased from .25 per unit to 1.1 outside the Central City and 1.5 in the Central City.

Liz Hormann: User survey-

- targeted bike parking at apartments.
- Looked at number and types of bikes that are owned by apartment dwellers
- Had a breakout for residents of buildings constructed after 2012
 - 44 responses from new buildings
 - Residents of these buildings are even more in favor of having secure storage areas.

Reza Farhoodi: What about people with really expensive bikes?

Liz: There were some people who would only park bikes in their apartments. But the overwhelming majority of respondents preferred to have a bike storage room. Many respondents complained that bike rooms were too full.

Guest: Rack removal is a zoning code violation. Properties can be cited for that.

Liz: Yes, but enforcement is complaint driven.

Jim Chasse: Is Glendoveer a transit oriented development?

Liz: I don't think so?

Reza: Are any of the buildings that you visited charging for bike parking?

Liz: No

Reza: Are any of the bikes in the full bike rooms abandoned?

Liz: Didn't get a sense of that.

Visiting the rooms was separate from the survey, so didn't have specific information on bike usage in the buildings she visited.

Reza: Believes that many of the bikes in the building that he lives in are either abandoned, or not being used at all.

Liz: Trying to figure out if the zoning code update will have a space for dictating management practices regarding bike storage.

Sarah: Even if we include rules about bike storage management, we wouldn't have tools to enforce those rules.

Staff recommendation is that long term parking requirement should not be allowed in units.
Bike parking requirements could be geographically heterogeneous.
Commercial parking requirements: Staff recommendation is for 1 space per 1750 sq ft in inner neighborhoods, and 1 per 3500 sq ft in outer neighborhoods.

Reza: The map that the group is using to visualize mode split is based on residences of respondents and not work locations.

Liz: We don't have the data on employment.

Jim: If you aren't requiring more bike parking in outer neighborhoods we may not be able to keep up as mode split increases in these neighborhoods in the future.

Roger Geller: The proposal would increase bike parking in outer neighborhoods, but the parking requirement would increase even more in inner neighborhoods.

Jim: Outer neighborhoods will become more bike centric in the future. Recommendations will lead to parking numbers that don't meet the future needs.

Rithy: Many survey questions talked about affordable housing. Taking away square footage for bicycle parking will increase the cost of the building and/or reduce living space.

Sarah: We currently have a FAR bonus incentive for showers and lockers that will be going away.

Rithy: You could create density bonuses for facilities that go beyond bike parking requirements.

Elliot: How does development and property management community feel about the proposals?

Sarah: There is lots of concern on their part.

They are concerned about additional floor space required if parking is not allowed in unit.

They are concerned about potential requirements for horizontal parking spaces.

Shayna Rehberg: The office developments that were cited, which went above and beyond existing bike parking; what drove that decision?

Sarah: High rates of bike parking are needed in Portland; otherwise tenants will not want to lease their buildings.

Seeing a similar effect in some residential areas, but not all.

Reza: How would code affect buildings that are office and residential.

Sarah: Square footage for each use is calculated separately. Residential is per unit, and office parking is calculated by square footage.

Reza: Would bike parking need to be separated?

Sarah: Right now the bike parking could be co-located. This could change. Co-location of bike parking could lead to security issues.

Guest: The idea of hanging a bike in my bedroom would prevent me from riding my bike.

If you are aiming for 15% mode split, you can't account for the fact that some businesses will have a much higher mode split, and others will have a much lower split.

Sarah: The process of getting the current code for long term office came from the 1994 taskforce. The original recommendations were higher than what got written into code due to political compromises.

Now the working group is trying to base their requirements on concrete numbers to justify their recommendations and insulate themselves from inevitable political issues.

Guest: Due to housing crisis, developers will argue that nothing pencils right now, and that adding biking requirements are going to make things worse for them.

Buildings that are being built now are going to be inadequate in 2030. But if we build bike rooms to 2030 standards, bike rooms will be half full for a decade, which could be problematic politically.

Sarah: The task force that made initial bike parking recommendations suggested that bike parking requirements should be increased over time. But this process never took place.

Keith Liden: You could give developers good information on best practices, including ideas about converting space to bike parking over time. That could allow for flexibility.

Sarah: Developers already can ask for a variance.

Keith: I think developers understand the need for bike parking from a marketing standpoint. But developers are uncomfortable with prescriptive standards.

Elliot: Commute mode share goals are mentioned a lot. We are shooting for a higher mode split for non-commute trips. A lot of these trips are errands. Is there a substantial update to short term parking standards to reflect the high mode split for non-commute trips?

Sarah: We are looking at the short term parking rates. Looking at visitation rates and trip generation rates that are being used in the SDC trip generation methodology.

Elliot: Would love to see covered parking required at grocery stores.

Could charge for access to bike rooms.

Are we updating the entire parking code, or is this independent?

Sarah: PBOT is looking at updating vehicle parking code. If the two elements are taken together it could delay implementation of bike code.

The SAC did not think that code should touch the idea of charging for bike parking. Wanted to leave it to developers.

We want buildings to be built to property lines. It would not be a desirable outcome for buildings to be set back to accommodate bike parking.

Elliot: What are triggers for bike parking?

Sarah: Under current rules, there are non-conforming use exemptions that allow bike parking requirements to not be met in central city, and for outer neighborhood developments that lack surface parking.

Elliot: There are some buildings that it would be impossible to provide ground floor bike parking. Could we have the possibility of elevators that are bike accessible or other options built into the code?

Christopher Achterman: How can we influence school facilities? Current parking levels are not sufficient.

Liz: One of the categories that we are looking at is schools. Working with safe routes to school to get mode split data for schools. Short term parking is for students and long term for staff under the current system. But offering long term parking for students would possibly be a better option.

Christopher: There should be an emphasis on best practices in schools, particularly for students in middle school and high school.

Liz: Eugene has a good safe routes to school resource for bike parking.

Jim: Safe routes to school is the way to get more parking in schools. David Douglas bike parking wasn't located correctly.

Rithy: Nonconforming uses could be prevented using code, in some cases.

Sarah: Need to investigate what can be done with nonconforming uses and what can't.

Keith: We got good feedback from this conversation.

Shayna: Because we are missing committee members this meeting, we would like to make sure that the priorities of others are reflected. May need to have an email conversation to establish what priorities of all committee members are.

Sarah: We need to be careful about what incentives we can provide.

Rithy: Stormwater best practices are adopted by reference. Bike parking best practices adopted in a similar way could allow more flexibility.

Thanks for the great presentation.

Transportation System Development Charges

7:30

Rich Eisenhauer: SDCs are one time fees charged to new developments which are used to pay for new trips that are generated by development.

- There are reimbursement fees or forward looking fees. Transportation fees are all for new capacity.
- Shifting from vehicle count methodology to a person trip methodology.
- SDC project selection started with TSP list. Used a selection process to winnow down the TSP projects.
- SDC funds can only be used for the growth elements of projects. They always must be leveraged with other funds.

Rithy: Rate structure is middle of the pack for SDCs in the region. Why was the decision made to set rates below Beaverton and Tigard?

Rich: Some districts that lack infrastructure are double what are seen in the presentation.

Focus groups felt that 50% rate structure was acceptable. Parks went much higher in their recent update.

Rithy: Would have liked to have a table that takes into account all fees.

Rich: Our fee structure is very different than surrounding communities. So apples to apples comparison is difficult.

Keith: Why does downtown get a discount if it is the location of the majority of expenditures?

Rich: The discount is science based, but it is also a policy decision.

We know downtown has a 60-70% mode split already. By moving to person trip, the Central City is going to see a big jump in rates. The discount softens the blow of that big increase.

Keith: What does it mean to be on the SDC list if not all of the projects are funded?

Rich: Getting on the SDC list is a big step. It provides funding and it helps to leverage other funding sources.

Roger: SDC list is flexible and easy to amend.

Rich: Looking at having an annual process for getting new projects into the SDC list.

Keith: What if there are immediate opportunities that could get on the list that weren't previously considered?

Rich: Those projects would have to go through a process to get on the list.

Elliot: Are you asking for a committee endorsement of the new rate target?

Rich: Yes. Testimony or letters of support would be great.

Elliot: The fact that the list is almost half active transport is good.

Rich: Projects that aren't anticipated to start by January 2018 are getting onto the new list. Projects that are already funded and anticipated to start before that date will continue, but won't make it to the new list.

Reza: What about the Flanders bikeway?

Rich: The whole project is fully funded, not just the bridge.

Rithy: We have 2 possible meetings prior to the end of the comment period to discuss providing committee support.

Keith: What would mechanics be for writing a letter?

Rithy: That's up for discussion at this point.

Shayna: Do we want to weigh in on the whole list, or just those elements that we are most interested in?

Elliot: What's the point of providing a 10-year project list?

Roger: We update the list on a 1-year basis. But that doesn't change the function of the 10-year list. Prioritization of projects is a policy process and a political process.

Keith: It's hard to tell if a project is on the list. What about Terwilliger Gaps?

Roger: That project is on the list.

Committee Report on 82nd Avenue

7:45

Elliot: Have been waiting for something to come back on 82nd that's worthy of bringing to the committee. The project is an ODOT project. The goal is to come up with a bike/ped focused project list. There is no funding attached to list.

Only funding identified for any projects is the 700,000 coming from Portland in the form of FOS.

Endorsements won't come out until after the Transportation budget is finalized. There will be a narrow window for comment after this happens before the list goes before the advisory committee.

Will there be an interest in the membership to have ODOT representative present the list to the BAC? BAC's vision for corridor is probably much greater than what is being proposed.

Shayna: Jurisdictional transfer is desired.

If there is an interest in bringing in ODOT, would it make sense to bring in PAC, as well?

Rithy: We have a couple of options: send feedback to ODOT about committee's views on this process. Send a letter to legislators.

Christopher: Would be most interested in talking to legislature.

Committee Business

7:55

Rithy: Even though the TGM grants proposals are mostly freight-focused, I think it would be a good idea for the BAC to support them by signing the letter. Any resources that can be secured by the City for planning purposes is a good thing, and any measures that relieve congestion for one transportation mode will benefit everyone else that is using the mode.

Roger: These proposals are not just freight. The Columbia proposal is multi-modal, and the Smart City proposal has a lot of elements that relate to autonomous vehicles. The City needs to get out ahead of the AV issue and get policy in place to stay ahead of the private sector.

Rithy: The PAC committee will be looking at the TGM proposals next week. We should wait until they have a chance to weigh in. We'll discuss signing the support letters with them after their next meeting.

Adjourn

8:14