

# 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](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation)

Dan Saltzman Commissioner Leah Treat Director

## Southwest In Motion (SWIM) Plan Stakeholder Working Group #3

### DRAFT Meeting Notes

Thurs. Jan 04, 2018 4:30-6:30 pm

Multnomah Arts Center: 7688 SW Capitol Hwy  
Room 8

*Members of the public are always welcome!*

---

#### 1. Welcome and Introductions (includes public)

Members of the Stakeholder Working Group (SWG), SWIM project team, and public went around the room doing introductions. No public comment to begin the meeting.

#### 2. Existing Conditions Update

Nick Falbo, the SWIM project manager, discussed the corrections made to the existing conditions report, which incorporated feedback from SWG members. He explained that these are high-level maps to orient that staff, working group and public to the plan area. If these elements are used in future stages, more detailed maps will be made available.

Comment: You're missing the 4T route in your existing conditions.

Response: If there are routes with missing facilities, you will be able to share what's missing during the interactive map component of the project.



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.

Question: Does the existing conditions include complaints from citizens? There are missing bike connections and other things that one SWG member reported online through 823-SAFE.

Answer: We can look in to how this data can be used as we move through the project.

Question: Is there anything in the existing conditions report that shows what changed?

Answer: We don't articulate changes line by line, but can find a way to make a more detailed change log available to those who want it.

### 3. Public Involvement Update

Nick shared the updates to the project timeline and public involvement plan. The team recognizes that people want to look at the data in greater detail and provide more feedback. Nick shared a timeline to map out the main SWG meetings we have planned for the project, which are supposed to address the previously noted deficiency of discussions. We will be alternating months with optional meetings to give people a chance to provide as much feedback as they hoped for when they signed up for the SWG.

Comment: You list the PTA at Markham, but you should include some PTA from the feeder schools, specifically those to Jackson.

Response: The PTA at Markham meeting is not intended to represent school interests, but rather to engage specifically with members of the Somali population. School interests are well represented with the ongoing SRTS strategy.

Question: Will you have a draft project list ready for this public engagement?

Answer: We won't. The focus at this stage is to get feedback from the public on prioritization criteria, and any additional needs. From this we'll be able to compare the similarities and differences between the different groups polling the criteria. This approach draws from the same process used on Growing Transit Communities. There will be some understanding of the potential project list because this will be available with the interactive mapping tool. There will eventually be an opportunity for people to weigh in on the project list, but this won't come until later in the process.

Comment: Make sure at the public engagement meetings to ask what's missing from the project list.

Response: We will do that with both the public engagement and interactive map.

Comment: We would like to see how the PedPDX and other planning efforts in the neighborhood relate to SWIM. Looking at the February data, it would be great if you could send out some information about what the PedPDX plan is before the February engagement.

Response: This project was initially intended to do a joint interactive outreach activity with PedPDX. The PedPDX effort was put on hold, so we are going out on our own. Everything we do for this project will be shared with the PedPDX team. Both projects will have an opportunity to build off each other.

Question: You mentioned the projects will be mapped. Does this include TSP projects?

Answer: We've been mapping everything we can get our hands on. The synthesis of all these plans will be used so we're not starting from scratch.

Comment: There are two plans for Hillsdale that are missing: the Hillsdale Town Center Plan, and Town Center Action Plan for Hillsdale.

Answer: We'll look at these. Also, some of you are aware of the Barbur Concept Plan. Some of these projects have to do with land use changes, like redeveloping land use parcels and establishing a trail. Those projects were not included.

Question: Is there going to be a way to look at network problems, or stressors, that are leading to a need for sidewalk? Is there anywhere in this project to look at the grouping of projects that are close together using a TDM lens?

Answer: There will be a refinement process, as well as looking at how to create lower cost versions of projects. There needs to be increased clarity regarding what we're trying to do long-term, along with what we can implement within SWIM's timeframe.

Question: Is the network connection and the mapping of the network somehow going to be visible when the projects are ranked?

Answer: That will be important criteria that will be taken into consideration.

Question: Are you using the SW Walking Map as a baseline piece of data? One concern is that SW trails and pathways use some private connections that might not show up in the data. Trail and pathway connections that are privately owned can play a key role for connecting the neighborhood.

Answer: We're hoping to have the formal *Southwest Urban Trails Plan* routes to prioritize projects.

*[Follow up Note: SWIM Plan focus is on facilities PBOT can build in the short term. Privately owned connections may not meet this requirement]*

Question: Do you want to schedule talks with the neighborhood organizations? When would be the best time?

Answer: May and June work best, especially because we'll be further along in the process and will have something more substantial to share.

Question: Are the dates for future meetings set in stone?

Answer: Generally, yes, July 5<sup>th</sup> is the one questionable meeting date.

Question: Is the expectation that we come to optional meetings?

Answers: If you want to dig deep, then we recommend you come to the meetings and give feedback. Some of the working group members want to get into the details provide more input on the planning process.

Comment: Looking at what we have for measures, we should have a meeting next month. Realistically, we should meet in March to put our rubber stamp on the measures, and *then* it could go to public engagement.

Response: We're bringing the top-level criteria to the public without the specifics of the measures or variables we'll be using. This allows us to talk about priorities without getting into the complexities of individual measures.

Regarding project lists, we'll have two lists at the end. One with the major projects, and one with projects implementable within the scope of SWIM. This will also require looking at funding sources in the future to see what's feasible to build using the various funding opportunities.

Question: Is part of the process to push major projects back into other plans (e.g., TSP, Bike Plan)?

Answer: Many projects will already be in the TSP, but this plan is an opportunity to recommend TSP additions.

Comment: We should push the meeting around July 5<sup>th</sup> because the topic is so important.

Group: Agreement that we should move the July 5<sup>th</sup> meeting to July 12<sup>th</sup>.

Response: The SWIM team will send out Outlook events for the entire series of meetings.

Note: Nick gave an update on PSU outreach, which was not as cohesive of a report as was hoped. We will be holding our own engagement efforts focused at reaching specific populations in southwest. SWG member Leah Safran is helping us work with the Jewish Community, and SWG member Tony Villagran is going to help us work with Home Forward. SWIM will also incorporate public feedback gathered from PedPDX.

Comment: One of the things we've done at our neighborhood organization is talk with the schools. It is important to use the schools as a resource during the planning process.

Response: Safe Routes to School is another planning effort that's been going on simultaneously and we're incorporating the results of this process into SWIM.

Note: The SWIM team will send out the PedPDX and see what we can share from the Safe Routes to School planning process. Safe Routes to School is trying to keep feedback focused to the individual schools, so we're not sure what we'll be able to share.

#### **4. Prioritization Criteria**

Nick explained how the SWIM project team is deriving the prioritization criteria. Prioritization is the beginning of the process and will hopefully point us in the right direction. Nick explained previous prioritization efforts that PBOT employed.

Comment: In the 2011 SWNI sidewalk prioritization you have access to Light Rail Station in there, which we still don't have. We need to consider the importance of access to a future Light Rail Transit station.

Response: Agreed.

Comment: You should look at density of locations, employment, and renters to determine routes that people use to commute to work. This includes those who bike or use alternate modes to get to work, or people who can't afford a car.

Response: You're going to find areas that get highlighted with equity and demand, along with completing connections, and we need to factor those into which projects rise to the top.

Question: Is improving access to the OHSU campus an equity question if people from lower socioeconomic statuses aspire to work up there?

Answer: There's a bit of an equity area highlighted on the hill because of renters, but this is a good question about how well the criteria may capture this.

Note: What we learned from talking with planners about criteria and prioritization: 1) limit criteria and measures to those big-issues that matter, 2) be aware of overlapping measures across multiple factors, and 3) measures should be readily available or easy to calculate.

Question: Primary prioritization is a score and then you'll go through refinement?

Answer: Yes. There are the primary prioritization criteria and then the prioritization refinement. The first phase is about picking the best, most useful projects. This second phase includes looking at which projects are likely to get funded, how projects match up with other bureau's projects (e.g., BES), etc.

The project staff asked working group members to go around the room, one by one, to briefly share their response to the draft prioritization criteria. Members were asked to answer two questions: 1) What criteria do you think is most important? 2) Do you think anything is missing? Working group members answered these questions, and offered reflection on measures or related issues.

### **What criteria is the most important?**

Safety, feasibility, and building on existing plans.

Support for the two-step prioritization process.

Connectivity and demand.

Safety, and the role geography plays with the different criteria.

Safety really is the most important

Network access and connectivity.

Network access, connectivity, demand, and safety.

Improvements in actual network, and key barriers in the network. Trails are important.

Safety shouldn't bump arterials up to the front and forget about collectors.

Demand – should also be more expansive by looking at schools, parks, and places where people want to go (Albertsons in speaker's neighborhood).

Safety – consider how to solve big problems like speeding (enforcement) through cheaper solutions.

Connectors, routes that will get you to a route and need a crossing to navigate a barrier.

Network access and connectivity kind of blur together. We need to distinguish, or combine the two.

Network access – regional trails.

Connectivity – alternative routes, speeding enforcement.

Safety – projects should include safety on routes, lighting to improve safety. SW Trails as a group to get feedback from.

Funding opportunities - Investment strategies from the city and how feasible funding is for projects.

Demand needs to be separate from network and connectivity.

### **Do you think any criteria are missing?**

Cultural shift (talked about at the first meeting) and a project that would do all these things. There are experiential variations between commuting on Barbur compared to Terwilliger.

Importance of SW Trails and how it gave people a place to go, while attempting to shift people away from car culture.

Find a way to value alternative routes as something that can address safety on our larger arterial streets, rather than just valuing the large streets themselves.

More thought about the streets that are the most enjoyable, or have the most potential for an enjoyable commute.

Consider a way to capture "Public Demand" for SW assets, such as recreational trails or other regionally serving facilities.

### **Comments related to Measures or Variables**

Too much emphasis on the Vision Zero network because it is more related to automobiles in SW. Vision Zero is longer term than this project. Safety is very important because of people's perceptions and fears.

Don't limit the understanding of barriers to gaps to just I-5. Smaller barriers are important. Pedestrian crossing of major streets (like Naito). We should be thinking about crossing the network of major streets.

Demand – Centers and PCC comparison. Hillsdale and OHSU. Need to factor in major destinations that aren't necessarily Centers.

Outcomes should reinforce what this group and the community outreach says. Projects that are the most supported, or supportive, should rise to the top.

Include Major points of access to destinations and network

Demand related nodes, smaller centers, which are not included in the Comp Plan Centers. Parks, churches, etc. Also, tourism, with a focus on citywide demand, needs to be factored into the criteria.

Consider how different solutions (neighborhood traffic calming) might be used instead of building sidewalks or paths.

Improve safety on the most dangerous streets, but it's important to think about problems on existing trails. An example is on SW Trail #1 and the steps from Whitaker to Terwilliger. This is a short distance from OHSU, but incredibly unsafe with the switchback.

There's a need to think about the dangerous component of routes, not just using crash data. Also need to think about places that don't get used right now

because they are deemed dangerous, or people are intimidated by a certain street (e.g., Naito).

Network should focus on the network for alternative modes (trips that enable a crosswalk). We don't have an inviting car free network. Need to have the same ability to run your errands without a car. You need the network to make those trips. Safety comes with the culture change that keeps getting mentioned.

Consider how smaller 'centers' and destinations such as parks, churches fit into the demand criteria.

Where does speeding/Speed control fit in?

Consider how to not to prioritize redundant/duplicative projects.

Supporting a *connected* network is critical

Concerns about using the LTIC equity measures, based on the outcomes from that process.

Regional Trails are an important network

How does lighting fit in to the analysis?

The 4T is a good tourist route

Criteria and measures should fit in well with the city's program/implementation categories.

Find a way to value complete connections that make projects useful.

Concern about over emphasis of the Vision Zero network – We only have a couple Vision Zero streets

Comment: Comp Plan [Major Trails Network] looked at network from an office, not on the ground.

### **Additional Comments**

SW trails is an important neighborhood organization, and should be included in the targeted outreach and should inform community support.

Need to have demonstration like Sunday Parkways to show people how different things could be (around the school to give people a chance to see what it could be like and make them realize they wouldn't need a car if things

were different, like the culture). Bring Sunday Parkways back to SW, but build something before that.

- Consider how to incorporate implementation through private development. Specifically, implementation of the bikeway network as a condition for development approval. These connections are often *not* provided by developers, because our plans are not specific or strong enough for development review to lean on for exactions and frontage requirements. **Our recommendations should be made in a way to allow for implementation as a part of the development review process.** City needs to require multimodal options, rather than just worrying about lawsuits.

Overview discussion about how these will be used. After we come up with the prioritized project what do we need to do to amend the TSP? People really need to understand what we use these for and what happens after the prioritization of projects.

Question: What are these networks that we keep talking about?

Answer: This includes designated city transportation network. The city has different networks (e.g., bike network, pedestrian network) that serve as a way of connecting places. We also have Safe Routes to School, PedPDX, and other networks that will likely match up with projects. Southwest Urban Trails has a network with projects attached to it. We will bring maps of these networks to provide more context later.

Comment: Importance of quiet and peaceful routes that are along collectors.

Response: It will be helpful to take these streets that you like and think about their role with the network overlaid.

## 5. Online Mapping Tool and Next Steps

Nick showed the SWG screenshots of the interactive mapping tool that will be used. This included showing the questions users will be asked, what will be displayed on the map, and how users can leave feedback.

Question: Will our input be seen by others?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Will there be an opportunity to agree with projects?

Answer: We're working on this.

Question: Safeline and PDX Reporter – Could we get this before the map goes live?

One member of the SWG wants to go through the data from these sources.

Answer: We'll check on it, and provide if available.

Question: How long will the map tool be available?

Answer: One month.

Question: Are all the network layers going to be in the map?

Answer: no. The online map will use a Google Maps basemap, along with a simplified project map.

We can provide blown up versions of those maps to compare with the interactive map.

Comment: We need more than a month to get the word out about this map. A month is not enough time.

## **6. Public Comment**

Public comment: On priorities, the SWIM team should look at places, for geographic reasons, there are absolute chokepoints. This includes Taylors Ferry where it crosses the east branch of Tryon Creek. No alternative for bikes and pedestrians here except walking on Taylors Ferry. High priority safety issues.

Adjourn