

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

Southwest In Motion (SWIM) Plan Stakeholder Working Group

Meeting Notes

Thurs. Nov 02, 2017 4:30-6:00 pm
Multnomah Arts Center: 7688 SW Capitol Hwy
Room 7

Members of the public are always welcome!

1. Welcome and Introductions (includes public) 4:30-4:55 PM

SWIM SWG members, the public, and SWIM team members went around doing introductions and talking about their interests in transportation issues around SW Portland.

Staff in attendance: Nick Falbo, Francesca Patricolo, Kevin Donohue

SWG members in attendance: Kathryn Daly, Marianne Fitzgerald, May Anne Cassin, Michael Harrison, Clair Carder, Katherine Christensen, Kelly Shepard, Rob Wilcox, Roger Averbeck, Keith Liden, Dave Manville, Don Baack, Leah Safran, Ryan Bass (Remote), Eric Wilhelm (Remote)

Public in attendance: John Gibbon, Doug Rogers, David Martin, Joanne Kahn

2. Project Process and Timeline 4:55-5:05 PM

Nick explained the current timeline and fielded questions regarding the schedule for future meeting dates.

Q: Where does SWIM fit into the TSP twenty-year framework?

A: The TSP has major transportation investments for the next 20 years. This project list is one of the sources for projects and we will use the prioritization that was already completed for these projects. SWIM projects will cover the first five years of those 20 years.

Q: Do you have more detailed meeting dates? When do we approve criteria before prioritization?



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.

A: We'll try to solidify dates before moving forward. Prioritization is the topic of the 4th SWG meeting.

Q: Will we be developing criteria that will support other planning efforts?

A: The goal is to coordinate with other projects and processes so that what we're doing supports other efforts. We'll be discussing Southwest prioritization factors later in the meeting.

Q: How many meetings? We should find these dates and schedule things.

A: We are hoping for a compact working group meeting schedule, but we can discuss having more meetings if it appears to be necessary.

Q: Does the plan get approved by council next year? Funding is decided by council, which is something we need to think about.

A: Yes, the plan will go to council. There is a small amount of Fixing our Streets money for crossings and protected bikeways that's assigned for this project. As we move forward, this plan will be very important for the city to guide future investments in Southwest. We will be coordinating with the current funding sources to make sure that our prioritized projects align with their interests.

3. Working Group Activities & Discussion

5:05- 6:00 PM

Funding Discussion

Nick gave an overview of the potential funding sources, who provides funding, and the type of projects that were eligible with the various sources. The Capitol Highway process and funding sources were used as an illustration to show how funding can come from numerous sources for larger projects.

Q: In the TSP there are major projects, as well as programs. Is there the potential for bike and pedestrian projects to fit into programmatic efforts?

A: Yes. Maybe some of them are major projects, but we could segment or make into smaller projects that fit the programmatic approach. The city source is more of what we're talking about for this project.

C: We're pushing really hard for BES to develop a stormwater systems plan for SW. They know they have a deficiency out here and the more we can partner with them the more we win.

A: We're excited to continue working with BES and use overlay analysis to figure out where there's opportunity for coordination.

C: You should add public/ private partnerships to this list (Wildwood example).

Q: If a space is left blank, is it not appropriate or applicable? For major projects, the funding needs to come from multiple sources and this should be spelled out in the chart.

A: Generally, this means Not Appropriate. The divisions here are fuzzy, for discussion purposes.

Q: Maintenance activity provides the opportunity to improve existing facilities without rebuilding the road.

A: Good point. Very common to introduce new bike infrastructure with a paving project and usually less expensive. This is something to consider as we move forward with the planning process.

Q: If there is already a large project going on, are smaller projects like striping rolled into the project? Quick win opportunities that can be incorporated to an existing restriping.

A: Only works if you have the space within the roadway. Up on Willamette Boulevard they're repaving, and are planning to restripe wide buffered bike lanes by reallocating space from the parking lane. Paving projects are only scoped with about a year advance, so we need to know what's in the works.

Q: What's the policy with new development and building sidewalks?

A: Developers are required to build to city standards. On unimproved streets they can pay into the Local Transportation Improvement Charge instead of building sidewalks.

Q: Does Local Transportation Improvement Charge (LTIC) money stay within the neighborhood?

A: The LTIC money goes into separate fund that they're writing the rules for right now. The money will be spent in the SW area where they did the Tryon Stephens Headwaters Plan. The number of projects and the money available won't pencil out. After SWIM, this money will trickle down to other areas that aren't being address. LTIC is a discussion for a different day.

NF: We need to have a connection between the projects and the different funding sources we have. SW Capitol – \$3.3 m FOS, \$6.5 m SDC, \$2m HB 5006. 20 years of planning to get the project funded. There are significant challenges to get projects of this scale built. Raises the question of rescoping projects into smaller parts to get us where we need to go.

C: This is phase 4 of the Capitol Hwy project and there are two more that still need to be completed. Piece of a vision for a longer corridor.

C: SWNI prioritized all of SW in 1991 and Capitol Hwy was prioritized as the number 1 priority.

C: PBOT needs to coordinate better within itself. Also, we need more coordination with other jurisdictions. Look for opportunities around the region.

C: Our working group doesn't represent the full diversity in Southwest. How can we get more voices integrated into our project?

NF: PSU MURP students are going to go out to do interviews and survey underrepresented groups in the area. There will be more opportunities for the public outside this working group.

Prioritization Discussion

Nick shared a summary memo documenting the results of the prioritization activity from SWG#1, to frame further discussion on prioritization factors. The group discussed the resulting factors, and whether some items could be merged, or if any were missing. The discussion went longer than expected, with no clear consensus on prioritization factor revisions. Members and staff felt prioritization of SWG factors was rushed and premature, the discussion pointed to important interrelationships between similar factors.

C: Recreation opportunity is an important factor. The importance of pedestrian transportation to the city as a whole. There are different walking tours led in SW by Mazama City Rambles and REI. It seems like there is potential for growing tourism in SW if the infrastructure improves.

C: Community support – Only has one bullet point and needs to be flushed out. In the era of scarce funding we need more information about what this means. The project list through this plan will have to be approved by SWNI. Does this constitute community support? Things like safety should be given higher priority.

C: The reputation and aesthetics of a neighborhood bring people in. This is something to consider during the planning process.

C: We should include the TSP prioritization methodology. Also, we should use this affinity activity and compare it to what we've said in the past. Need to factor in criteria and feedback from other plans done in the study area. Active transportation and network gaps in the area. We would need three meetings to come up with these criteria on our own.

A: We would come to the meeting with criteria for us to decide on. Not trying to reinvent the wheel.

C: There are things that could be grouped together. Opportunity and return on investment could be lumped together in a category that has to do with financial opportunities. Safety is a bottom line issue that will be weighted more than everything else.

C: Equity might be another item missing from the list.

C: It would be helpful if all the material was sent out before the meeting, like the prioritization activity, to keep all SWG members in the loop.

The meeting was running over time, and the agenda was cut short at this point.

4. Public Comment

6:00 – 6:10 PM

C: It would be great to see a full meeting schedule and more detail on the site.

C: With the residential infill project, there is concern about an increase in traffic. PBOT needs to think about the utilization of streets and accommodating people's transportation habits. We should pump the brakes on development until we figure out transportation needs and not let things get built insufficiently, like in the past.

Adjourn