

PBOT

PORTLAND BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION

1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Dan Saltzman Commissioner **Leah Treat** Director

August 16, 2017

To: Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

cc: Julie Ocken
Sandra Wood
Eric Engstrom

From: TSP Team
Courtney Duke, Project Manager
City and Regional Policy/Transportation Planning
Policy, Planning and Projects Group

RE: TSP3 Team Response to PSC issues and questions

This memo responds to questions from the PSC from the June 13, 2017 TSP3 Briefing and an email from Commissioner Chris Smith. It also includes information about community engagement and public comment.

The Proposed Draft will be published on August 18, with a PSC hearing on September 26. Please let us know if you have questions or need additional clarification. Thank you for your time and attention.



The Portland Bureau of Transportation fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the ADA Title II, and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. For accommodations, complaints and information, call (503) 823-5185, City TTY (503) 823-6868, or use Oregon Relay Service: 711.

Notes and Questions from Commissioners from PSC Briefing June 13, 2017

Emergency Response Classifications

What are the design implications of Secondary Emergency Response Classifications? If they are intended to be rarely used, why designate them at all?

Response: The design implication is that on Secondary Emergency Response Streets, PBOT would be able to install fire-friendly speed cushions without needing to ask permission from Portland Fire & Rescue. In the past, these negotiations have added significant time and expense to traffic calming projects.

Digital Document

Have a map that is pan-able and zoom-able that shows how the system connects with what is going on in the central city and adjacent jurisdictions. Links between the digital document map and Portland Maps (and vice-versa).

Response: Yes, the TSP digital document will have a mapping portal where the user can pan and zoom, and turn layers on and off. It will also be linked to PortlandMaps. It will include all projects and classifications citywide, including the central city. We will not be showing data for adjacent jurisdictions, that is beyond the scope of the TSP and is something that the Regional Transportation Plan could coordinate.

Freight Classifications

Please up the timeline on updating the freight elements of the transportation system plan (Freight Master Plan)

Response: The Freight Master Plan does not yet have funding or a scope for an update. Freight staff is actively seeking funding. TSP Staff will work with Complete Streets staff and manager to determine schedule and timeline. We will inform them of PSCs interest in the update and timeline.

People-moving Strategy

Why isn't Freight in the people-moving strategy?

Response: A key part of the development of the people moving strategy (Comp Plan Policy 9.6) was bringing together the chairs and vice chairs of the pedestrian, bicycle, and freight advisory committees. The consensus recommendation, supported by City staff, was that freight fit better outside the people-moving strategy, in part because moving goods is inherently different than moving people. This recommendation was forwarded by the PSC to City Council and adopted by City Council in June 2016.

Performance Measures

How do we capture the people who neither want to work at home nor at work in the mode share targets/measurement? They may want to travel to somewhere nearer to home to work (e.g. a cafe or library)

Response: Trips taken for work, whether or not to an employment site, should be captured in a household travel survey. As travel options like shared mobility, automated vehicles, and electric bicycling expand, and to better understand the extent of “partial” or “local” work trips, we will need more frequent travel surveys to better inform decision-making. We are also proposing to add work from home trip share in the performance measures.

Email from Commissioner Chris Smith

Classifications Maps (Map App)

- 1) What's the rationale for having the 15th/Thurman/Vaughn segments between Naito and 23rd/Vaughn classified as a Major City Traffic Street? Volumes feel low to me, and isn't part of this likely to be vacated as part of intersection improvements at 23rd/Vaughn? Are we predicting major growth in traffic over the next 20 years?

Response: PBOT staff were deliberately holding off on major changes to the traffic classifications in inner NW Portland because an upcoming planning process is expected to make recommendations for traffic classifications. However, it is true that these segments are being reconfigured as part of the 20th Ave LID project, so it would make sense to adjust them as part of TSP Stage 3. Staff will revise the map for the Proposed Draft.

- 1) Shouldn't we be planning additional significant N/S Transitways east of 122nd?

Response: TriMet's Service Enhancement Plans shows additional service on 148th and 162nd, and this is reflected in the Discussion Draft through the designation of Transit Access Streets on both streets. The Transit Access Street designation is appropriate for planned non-frequent transit, which is the case for 148th and 162nd. The Regional Transitway classification is meant for dedicated-lane and/or grade-separated transit such as light rail or bus rapid transit. There are currently no plans for such service east of 122nd.

Introduction

- 2) Can we make safety the first of the seven outcomes?

Response: Yes; we will change it.

Objectives

- 3) 9.29.b regards opposition to the westside bypass. If we remove this (as proposed) do we have a firm basis in policy elsewhere to continue opposition?

Response: PBOT will continue to have opposition in the proper policy and/or leadership roles as needed.

- 4) Project and program selection criteria (p 2-27). I support the suggestion to incorporate the TSP Project Selection Prioritization Criteria, particularly the heavy weighting on equity criteria.

Response: Thank you.

Pattern Areas

- 5) Should Gateway be moved to the Inner Neighborhoods pattern area? Rationale: in the future the level of intensity of development and transportation needs will more closely match inner neighborhoods than eastern neighborhoods?

Response: The Pattern Areas were adopted by City Council and will not be modified as part of the TSP3 process. We will convey these concerns to BPS staff.

- 7) Should the Eastern Neighborhoods Pattern Area have a policy specifically supporting the creation or growth of neighborhood and town centers given the current scarcity of such centers?

Response: The Pattern Areas were adopted by City Council and will not be modified as part of the TSP3 process. We will convey these concerns to BPS staff.

Classifications

8) The term "interregional" is used 7 times in the document, including in Policy 6.6. I assume it refers to (for example) a trip from Portland to Salem, but it's a sufficiently obscure word that it may not be clear. Could we define it in the glossary?

Response: Staff will add "interregional" to the glossary in the Proposed Draft.

9) Policy 6.6 "access to transit" describes "first- and last-mile connection opportunities" for bikes and other modes. Shouldn't we be thinking about a 3-mile radius for bike connectivity given other Comp Plan policies?

Response: The terms "first-mile" and "last-mile" are commonly used to refer to the first or last leg of a trip, regardless of distance.

10) Major Transit Priority Streets - suggest including language to allow/consider use of exclusive transit lanes (in addition to transit priority lanes).

Response: PBOT staff intended for the term "transit priority lane" to be inclusive of a range of treatments including exclusive transit lanes. We can clarify this better in the Proposed Draft.

Performance Measures

11) 9.26i/9.26j Continuing to rely on Level of Service gives undue priority to SOVs, which are at the bottom of our transportation strategy. I strongly suggest immediate replacement of LOS as a standard, particularly for development review. Here are a few ideas on candidates:

- VMT Reduction (as California is doing)
- Vision Zero - can review focus on safety issues near the development?
- Completeness of bike and pedestrian network near the development?
- Transit mobility (I believe there is already an existing manual for measuring this: TCQSM?). It would be a more appropriate proxy for corridor mobility than an SOV measure is

Response: The 9.26.i. Level of Service proposed change suggests an evaluation of alternative evaluation measures to improve safety while reducing vehicle miles traveled. PBOT is currently undergoing that evaluation specifically focused on the development review process. It is noted that the City of Portland's current approach to assessing transportation impacts during the development review process is misaligned with the multimodal goals articulated in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan. Currently, and as has been the case for over 50 years, development review utilizes the PM peak intersection Level of Service (LOS) metric to evaluate impacts of new development. This approach only addresses automobile operating conditions when assessing local impacts of new development and is not reflective of Portland's

multimodal goals. Building on the recent work that has been done to update the City's Transportation System Development Charge approach, alternatives evaluation will leverage the City's commitment to utilizing a person-trip framework and ongoing person-trip data collection to align system-level and site-level impact analysis more directly. PBOT staff will consider alternative metrics, including VMT, Vision Zero, System Completeness, SOV mode share, Congestion, ATG, etc. The effort is being led by PBOT's Development Permitting & Transit Group, in collaboration with Policy, Planning & Projects, Engineering, and the Bureau of Planning Sustainability. Outcomes of this workshop can be made available to the Planning & Sustainability Commission for review and feedback.

Bicycle Commute mode share

12) I have a strong preference to retain the 25% goal from the Climate Action Plan. We're way too early in this process to through in the towel. If the model doesn't show the results we're seeking, we should be looking at what additional policies can get us there (congestion pricing, dedicated lanes for cycling and transit, TDM, etc.).

Response: The Proposed Draft (August 18, 2017) will have a 25% bike mode share target.

TSP3 Team Update: Public Comment and Issues

The Discussion Draft was open for 64 days from May 19 – July 21. Staff provided TSP outreach at 30 events across the city from the Multnomah Arts Center, to the Kenton Firehouse, to the Rosewood Initiative, and JAMS Space. Staff is currently reviewing the over 120 individual comments we received during the Discussion Draft (some with multiple signatories). Among the comments we received, we heard the most about 1) Interest in a TDM study for the West Hills (Section 3: Geographic Policies) and 2) proposed street classifications on SE 20th Ave (Section 4: Street Classifications).