

Bicycle Advisory Committee Meeting
City Hall, Lovejoy Room
6-8pm June 13, 2017

BAC Members Present: Rithy Khut (Chair), Elliot Akwai-Scott (Vice Chair), Roger Averbeck, Dan Bower, Jim Chasse, Maria Erb, Reza Farhoodi

BAC Members Not Present: Ian Stude, Christopher Achterman, Jocelyn Gaudi, Keith Liden, Kirk Paulsen, Besty Platt, Shayna Rehberg, Evan Ross, Kari Schlosshauer

PBOT Staff: Judith Grey, Wendy Cawley, Roger Geller, Daniel Soebbing

BPS Staff: Michelle Kunec-North

Metro Staff: Lake McTighe

Guests: Jonathan Maus, Ulysses Toledo, Charlotte Durvisseau, Luke Norman, Marvin Rambo

Introductions/Announcements

6:05

Reza Farhoodi: PSU Masters in Urban and Regional Planning (MURP) students presented to the Commission on Planning and Sustainability their findings on NW 13th as a car free street.

Prosper Portland and ODOT are working on a Union Station rehab, including a new train track allowing freight trains to bypass the station. They will be rebuilding the entire crossing, which is a bad place for bikes currently.

Regional Transportation Plan Call for Projects

6:07

Judith Gray: Thanks for switching the schedule to accommodate a second meeting that I must attend this evening.

- The RTP has the function of combining transportation, land use, and growth.
- It has a project list that is intended to accommodate growth.
- RTP is not a City of Portland Plan
- It is managed by Metro
- Metro maintains the RTP to make sure that the region is eligible for Federal and State transportation funds.
- The RTP update is a 3+ year process.
- We are currently at the "Call for Projects" time.
- The purpose of the Call for Projects is to reconcile existing plans, not to propose brand new plans.

Reza Farhoodi: There is no modal committee for transit. What is the outreach for transit projects?

Judith: Growing Transit Communities is an ongoing project that won't have completed council approval in time to complete the RTP. But there has been an opportunity for public comment on transit projects through the Enhanced Transit Communities project.

You all received a copy of the draft RTP list from Roger on Friday. If you have feedback on the project list, you should send a note to Roger.

The RTP project list allocates \$1 billion to Portland. Portland's TSP list contains \$1.4 billion of funding. Not all of Portland's priority projects make it onto the list. This is a subset of Portland's most important projects, and it doesn't include smaller projects of less than \$1 million, which are included on the TSP.

Important/Priority Policies:

- Vision Zero
- Equity
- Access to Transit

Powell/Blvd, SW Corridor, and other big regional projects

Roger Averbeck: I'm glad that the call for projects includes major corridor projects. How does it work when the corridor projects are on ODOT facilities? What about jurisdictional transfers?

Judith: ODOT has roads that they own, but maintaining them is not a priority for them. Powell Blvd. is an example. At the last regional meeting, ODOT showed that they are putting the majority of their money into freeways. They acknowledge jurisdictional transfer in their plan.

Jurisdictional transfer is a possible strategy for getting these roads fixed, but our priority should just be getting these roads fixed. It doesn't matter how it happens, but it needs to happen.

SW Corridor will be included in the list because the region has adopted it. That's the same for interchange projects that have been identified in Division Transit Project

Roger Averbeck: There is a whole set of projects that would come in with the SW Corridor project, and there are other projects that the City and partners will also tack on.

Judith: Those projects will be included.

TriMet will include a project in the RTP for creating light rail.

Lake McTighe: The budget that Judith is referring to is built on the assumption that a state transportation budget will be passed. SW Corridor also assumes that a regional bond measure will be passed to match state funds. There are other funding assumptions, and they all may need to be adjusted based on outcomes of state funding negotiations and TriMet's decision to bond light rail.

Roger Averbeck: There needs to be a lot of specificity about projects that will be included with SW Corridor that will address ped and bike issues.

Reza: Some project timelines don't match up with SDC list timelines. For example, there's a Central City Multimodal project listed for the 11-20 year timeframe.

Roger Geller: There is also a phase of Central City Multimodal that is 1-10 years. A number of other projects that are focused on Centers that have been broken into two phases.

Reza: There's a project in my neighborhood that has a different timeline than what is in the RTP list.

Judith: The timelines in the list are changeable.

Rithy: Are we looking for big area projects that are for tens or hundreds of millions, or smaller projects that are targeted to specific areas? As a committee we need to narrow our priorities so that we can get members onto the project steering committees, because these lists are large and unwieldy.

Judith: When you look at the spreadsheet you can see projects that are grouped into A, B, and C lists. A is near term. B is longer term. C is a list of projects that are further out on the horizon. The most important feedback that you can give is on the priorities of these lists, and whether or not the projects are arranged on the list in the correct timeframes according to priorities.

Dan Bower: The committee was OK with the TSP. The RTP is a selection of TSP projects. So we should be OK with this list, assuming that the priority projects from the TSP made it onto the RTP.

Lake: We have an evaluation of the entire plan. When the evaluation period happens it would be a good time for the committee to come together to provide a support letter.

Elliot Akwai-Scott: The committee's most important feedback would be to provide input if there are gaps in the list.

Judith: Partly. But analysis has already been done on these projects.

Elliot: So where is there room for feedback from the committee?

Judith: If you see a project that should be here, you should send a note to Roger Geller.

As to Roger Averbeck's question, if you think that Powell Blvd is a priority that needs to be addressed above others, you should send a note supporting work on Powell.

Jim Chasse: The division transit project is reliant on \$100 million of federal funding. There's no guarantee that the federal money will ever happen. What will happen if the money doesn't come through?

Judith: We would continue to pursue it even if the money doesn't come through immediately. We would continue to assess whether or not the project is competitive.

Dan: Two recent projects were funded that weren't listed in the RTP. Central City Multimodal bundled together a number of smaller projects.

Judith: I don't think we'd get that project funded today. But bikeshare is an example of a project that wasn't on the RTP that we got funded.

N Vancouver Avenue Reconfiguration

6:45

Roger Geller: N. Vancouver has been a problem for a long time because of freeway ramps, other crossings.

Wendy Cawley: We have quite a few angle crashes because of the off ramp. These include auto/auto crashes, auto/bike crashes, and auto/ped crashes. Moving the bike lane to the other side of the street helped to address the auto/bike crashes. But that hasn't helped with the sideswipe type crashes that are still a big issue.

We are currently weighing options that would eliminate the weave, or separate bikes and cars in space or time.

Option 1. Create a bike box at Fremont. This would bunch bikes to try to create gaps for cars to get through without bike conflicts. But there are so many bikes at peak hours that there really wouldn't be any gaps.

Reza: Would there be a bus queue jump?

Wendy: If we signalize it, there would be.

Jim Chasse: What's the speed limit there.

Wendy: 25 mph

Dan Bower: I don't think the first option will solve any problems.

Reza: All the improvements are at Fremont, with no improvements a block south. Because of this, I agree with Dan.

Wendy: Second option involves a queue jump, but because there is such a long line of bikes, there will still be a weave problem.

Reza: What's the difference between full queue jump or partial queue jump?

Wendy: To provide a full que jump for all of the bikes would require 13 seconds to get ahead of cars to eliminate conflicts with cars. We usually only provide 7 seconds.

Elliot Akwai-Scott: What about queue jump options for buses?

Wendy: We could do a queue jump for buses and bikes.

Elliot: Is there a bus only lane?

Wendy: Yes

Elliot: Is there heavy bus traffic?

Wendy: 11 per hour in rush hour.

Dan: The buses get stuck in traffic. From a bus perspective, only retrofits that move traffic through the whole section will make a difference. Just fixing this intersection won't address the problem.

Wendy: We did explore a grade separated bike flyover structure. But it isn't financially feasible.

Third option would be to cross the bike lane over to split the straight lane and the right turning lane.

Fourth option is a bike signal at Vancouver and Cook. Would cause a delay for bikes because they would have a red phase that would occur while cars are moving.

Rithy Khut: How much of a delay would there be for bikes?

Wendy: The model shows traffic spilling over. There would be a delay of an additional 90 seconds for autos, and an additional 30 to 40 second delay for bikes. The queue would back up further onto Freemont than they already do.

Roger Averbek: A bike box wouldn't help and you don't get good compliance with no turn on red signs?

Roger Geller: You can get better compliance with a flashing sign, as at Grand and Couch.

Dan: There is a whole separate PBOT project that is working on improving bus service on Vancouver.

Wendy: We should talk.

There is another option that would require traffic entering the freeway to make loops through the neighborhood.

Reza: If cars are made to do the loop they will just dangerously cut across 3 lanes of traffic to make a right turn, instead of following the directions.

Wendy: Another option is just flopping the bike lane and the car lanes. This is a cheaper option.

It addresses the jockeying between bikes and buses on Williams.

Roger Geller: There was another option that we talked about: closing the onramp.

Reza: What would legacy Emmanuel think about this?

Wendy: I didn't think closing the ramp would be a serious proposal. It would be expensive because there would be a lot of mitigation.

We've been talking about these options for 3 years. Now we feel like it's time to pull the trigger. We think we can get some money to implement an option.

Rithy: New Seasons is a difficult conflict point. The last option adds delay to bicycles, which is a problem.

Reza: Why does this cost so much?

Wendy: Adding the signal

Reza: Having to switch sides makes this less palatable to me. If bikes could stay on the left side for longer it would make more sense.

Wendy: We would have to look more closely at signals to the south to see if that works.

We know that it would work at the intersection with Alberta.

We are aware of the problem with the driveway to New Seasons.

Maria Erb: I like the idea of moving to the left hand side to remove conflicts with buses.

Dan: If you are going to move the lane to the left you should do it north of Cully.

Wendy: If you do the transition close to Cook you will be affecting twice as many bikes.

Elliot: Is the issue just the peak? Are we trading issues that address peak traffic for issues that affect traffic at other times of day? Would cars coming out New Seasons block the bike lane?

Dan: I'm surprised that there have only been 2 crashes here.

Wendy: It's such a mess that everybody has to be on their best behavior to get through.

Dan: I think the best option would be to get cars through ahead of bikes at Freemont, instead of letting bikes through ahead of cars.

Wendy: Dan's thought is similar to the split phase, but it reverses the sequence.

Dan: Nobody uses the left turn lane on Vancouver at Cook. It's a waste of space. The left hand bike lane could utilize this space.

Maria: In early evening motorists and bikers are confused about where they are supposed to go. Dashes across the intersection are key.

Elliot: Moving the bus stops to integrate them into the queue jump?

Dan: You would have to move 3 different bus stops to accommodate that.

Elliot: Judging from other bus merging areas at other parts of the City, bus merging takes a lot more time than any other types of merges.

Rithy: If we did things like Utrecht, we would move bikes to the right and make other modes accommodate the bikes. We could do floating bus islands with bus only lanes. It would address bus backups, while providing space for bikes.

We should signalize and add delay to address Vision Zero goals.

Dan: If you address bikes without addressing other modes, you are going to have push back.

Portland Off-Road Cycling Master Plan

7:25

Michelle Kunec-North: The purpose is to develop a system of off-road trails.

All of the agencies that own land within the city are involved in the planning.

There are currently 42 miles of trails in the City, but most of those miles are access roads. Single track and trail numbers are much lower.

Most people are looking for beginner to moderate trails, and ½ to 2 hours of activity.

Impacts are similar to hiking, and less than horseback riding. Impacts are dependent on trail construction.

We are trying to create more places throughout the City that can provide outdoor biking opportunities that are linked together.

There are few places in the City that can accommodate a 3-11 mile trail experience, so we are looking at options where short sections of dirt trails and skills areas can be linked with paved trails.

Community events and open houses targeted north and east Portland communities. We sought to do outreach in more diverse areas.

There was a strong desire for equity in locating trails, in terms of citing facilities around the city, and citing locations near transit.

We are currently working on the draft plan, which will go to Council this fall.

We are not to the point of proposing recommendations yet.

We hope to come back to the BAC with the draft plan for additional feedback.

Rithy: It's been nice having Jocelyn on the committee to keep the BAC notified of what has been happening in this project.

Roger Geller: How are trail advocate groups responding to the process?

Michelle: We have participation from the NW trail alliance. They have members on the committee, who have been doing outreach to their group. We have had participation from the Bicycle Transportation Alliance (now The Street Trust), although this isn't part

of their normal purview. We have SW Trails onboard too, as well as the Mazamas, and other trail oriented groups.

Elliot: The idea for this project is very different and very unique in the transportation/bicycling world. I look forward to following along and providing feedback as you draft your recommendations.

Michelle: If someone is interested in going for a ride that goes longer than just the 6 miles that can be ridden at Powell Butte, they are looking to the City's transportation network to get them to other locations in the City. I think the committee could be helpful to provide links to people that want to get between different trail destinations.

Jim: I saw a family with parents and a couple of kids who were from inner Portland on their way to outer neighborhoods who stopped at Ventura park to get some outdoor recreation for their kids at the pump track. I was really impressed by the conversation that I had with the family, and I think that small trails like the one at Ventura are a great opportunity for kids to get outside in a small contained space.

Rithy: In terms of Forest Park, does it make sense to update the management plan of Forest Park? There was supposed to be a study that was never done. This plan needs to interact well with the Forest Park management plan. Even if we identify locations in Forest Park that are appropriate there is going to be the question of whether proposals are compatible with the management plan.

Michelle: We don't want to propose a project that we don't think is going to be successful.

The management plan isn't actually a trail plan. It's about restoring natural resource quality in the park. If you were going to design a trail system in the park today, it probably wouldn't look like what exists now.

Rithy: Because the ecological study hasn't been done, we don't know what's there. Because we don't know what's there, people can always use uncertainty as an excuse to stop new proposals from happening.

Michelle: We will be back in a couple of months. Please call or email if you have any other ideas.

Committee Business

7:50

Rithy: Everyone in the committee was appointed 2 years ago. We need to start the process of getting new members because there are vacancies. I believe we have 4 alternate positions available.

If anyone wants to get involved in the recruitment process, I would like to invite their participation.

The ideal is that we will form the committee, revamp our forms, meet with Roger to figure out timelines, open application in the fall, score and make recommendations in December, and try to appoint new members by January 1st.

Reza: What's the timeline for getting new members.

Rithy: The ideal is get them onboard by January 1st.

Roger Averbeck: We should also get a handle on who needs to reapply. This is not a lifetime appointment.

Rithy: We have a spreadsheet and we keep attendance records. The committee will look at attendance records of existing committee members and discuss with members whether or not they want to stay on the committee.

Please send me an email if you are interested in participating.

I think I have to be on the committee, but I don't know what our bylaws say.

Roger Averbeck: You should have people on the committee that don't have to reapply, you should have staggered terms.

Rithy: All current members were appointed at the same time.

Adjourn 8:00