

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 #4

Meeting Agenda

Thurs. Feb 01, 2018 4:30-6:30 pm

Stephens Creek Crossing

6715 SW 26th Ave

Members of the public are always welcome!

-
1. **Welcome and Introductions (includes public)** 4:30-4:35 PM
Meeting commenced with 5-minutes for initial public comments.
 - Concern about getting the Red Electric Trail built and making changes to Scholl's Ferry (potential road diet).
 - Andy from NW Trails – Appreciative of SWIM work. He thinks there are ways to increase the interconnectivity of routes by allowing people to cut through open spaces. He's hopeful we will consider other routes that aren't paved.
 - Regarding the Corbett/ Lair Hill area, there is concern about crossing under the Tram on Naito. There's no friendly crossing, especially if you're pushing a baby stroller.

 2. **Working Group Membership Update** 4:35-4:40 PM
Within the last few months there have been changes to representation on citywide committees, which Roger Averbeck discussed. He explained changes to term limits like the Pedestrian Advisory Committee and Bicycle Advisory Committee. These changes are excluding some members from serving on these committees and there have been leadership changes with some of the chairs reaching their term limits.

 3. **Public Engagement Update and Online Mapping Tool** 4:40-5:00 PM
Nick outlined the outreach completed up until 2/1/2018 and explained that the mapping tool will be available until March 16th.



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.

- Comment: Roger spent a good amount of time on the map and feels that there needs to be more information about the projects. This includes the price of projects and how things might get funding.
Response: Things like pricing will get factored in as a part of the prioritization process.
- Comment: Concern about the map getting too busy with user comments. Might want to use a cutoff date to limit the amount of data being visualized. Might be helpful to allow users to turn layers on and off. Also, what are other avenues for sharing this tool?
Response: We've considered changing the visibility of comments by the scale of the map, or using time expiration. We want the SWG members to distribute to their networks.
- Comment: SW News would be a great place to advertise. One SWG member emailed a friend who is visually impaired, who said the map is not accessible.
Response: We're doing a paper map version to help make the map more accessible to a wider range of people. This includes focus groups with different people.
- Comments: 1) Slavin Rd as part of the Red Electric needs to be corrected, 2) we have worked with the community to think through the right-of-way acquisition to implement some of these projects, 3) gravel paths are just fine for a lot of these proposed trail projects, 4) aerial imagery would be helpful to locate where you are on the map, and 5) couldn't find how to like a project so he doesn't have to comment again.

4. Prioritization Measures and Variables

5:00-6:25 PM

Nick discussed some of the feedback received up until 2/1 regarding the prioritization measures. He asked the SWIM SWG if there's anything missing from the list. Networks used for prioritization were also discussed. The preliminary list includes: city walkways, transit access streets, Safe Routes to School, SW Urban Trails routes, the Regional Bikeway Network, and Difficult Connections (PBOT map). There was also discussion about gaps and difficult connections.

- Comment: Historic form with the streetcars that used to exist would be interesting for better understanding the history of the right-of-way.
- Comment: It would be interesting to see the comments from other people. Concerned about the experience that other people have when walking. It will make a difference if people walk or not. Even if there's a sidewalk on a busy street, people will prefer to use a local street to walk. Same goes for bicycles. We really need to think about how people experience the pedestrian and bicycle environment.
- Comment: Some concern that we can't have too many measures if we're going to prioritize. We need to think through how we're going to use these measures to get us where we want to go.
- Comment: Experience could be captured by doing a pilot project like what's been done with the B-H Hwy striping of a pedestrian lane. This type of demonstration might get

people thinking differently about how they use space and get from one place to another. Maybe piggyback off this B-H Hwy project and get 10 more rubber curbs. You could put the SWIM website on these rubber curbs to help make people aware. By showing potential changes, it would be helpful for initiating a culture change that keeps coming up, along with safety concerns that keep people to local streets (people avoiding arterials and collectors without sidewalks). What's the timeline for the B-H Hwy rubber curbs?

Response: We will look into the B-H Hwy rubber curbs.

- Comment: We need fewer categories. It seems like the 6 categories could be turned into 3. We need to talk about all bus stops, not just frequent routes. There is also a need to factor in the elderly people and their access. Maybe we can use Strava data to see what routes people use.

Response: How we factor experience into the prioritization is something important that we need to consider.

General Discussion of Criteria and Measures

- Comment: Perception of safety using facilities – have a choice versus no choice and forced to use a route despite safety concerns.
Response: Alternate measures are needed to think about the approach and how things get high, higher, and highest scores. More refinement needed to determine what is the most important.
- Comment: Highest ranked projects that come out of this prioritization need to be competitive financially and politically when competing on the city/ regional scale.
Response: We've already been discussing funding and feasibility with the people who control funding and understand the politics.
- Comment: You need to consider that lack of bikes/ pedestrians because people don't feel comfortable using these modes.
Response: We need to talk more about this. Pedestrian and bicycle data is not that reliable. We also need to determine how much we focus on bike and pedestrian crashes.
- Comment: People need to feel comfortable walking or biking. At some point, you need to not focus on HCN, but look at the facilities that people have access to. You need to rank the aesthetics and how they'll feel to gain a true sense of how much a project could increase people using these alternative modes. There's got to be a way to understand the impact of improvements on a street like Barbur for changing the bike and pedestrian habits.
Response: This will come into play when comparing arterials/ collectors with parallel routes that are lower stress.
Comment: Also need to factor in planters and other aesthetics that help people enjoy the pedestrian environment more.

Response: These projects are still at a high-level, so it might be harder to get to this level of design.

- Question: Is it possible to get noise or traffic speed to determine perceived risk?

Response: There may be a way to talk about this.

- Comment: Important to consider that people with children or disabilities might feel more vulnerable on Barbur than the people in this group.
- Comment: Dilemma between fixing critical barrier or putting sidewalk on a busy street. We don't know what routes people will use because we don't have the facilities right now. Don't just ask people what routes they use, ask what routes they would use if they existed.
- Comment: Talk about criteria that you put together. Discussion about projects that need to be competitive on a city and regional level. The facility that Ryan is talking about, filling that critical connection, is much more feasible because you don't need all the infrastructure that comes with major projects on arterials and collectors (trigger stormwater, other things that really raise the price).
- Questions: Regarding jobs and housing maps – do we have any tracking that shows short trips (2 miles) in SW?

Response: We have a traffic model that shows the short trips, but it's car trips. Might shed some light on short car trips that could be replaced if the bike/ ped infrastructure was in place.

- Comment: Stormwater is half of our needs and BES should be rolling out their Stormwater System Plan this spring. Developers continue to build without paying for stormwater. What's the outcome? The priority should be to get the most people out walking and biking, stormwater or not.
- Comment: History regarding stormwater and sewer maintenance. City has trouble maintaining the facilities it already owns. Some bike and pedestrian projects with minimal infrastructure changes will help the city save money and implement projects more easily.

Response: This comes into play later when we get into the project refinement phase.

Discussion of "Connected Networks" Criteria and Measures

- Comment: Gaps versus network completion – value of money for small project versus big project that can't get funding.
Response: There's a gap map that we'll cover shortly.
- Comment: SW Trails is a good metric for getting a sense of the off-street routes that people use to get through the area.
- Comment: There's an additional 200 local trails that are not on this map. They were on the spaghetti map that was used for the original SW Urban Trails plan. There's a bunch

more that were on the spaghetti map that won't get on here and serve vital connections. It would be possible to take an inventory.

Response: This is something to discuss later.

Comment: Overlaying the maps make sense. The spaghetti map wasn't adopted by City Council, but the SW Urban Trails plan was. We already have a significant list of projects in SW.

- Comment: Fully support using these designations. Want to make sure that we're clear on the measurable benefit and getting to the criteria that warrants that designation. Taylors Ferry Road where there are no safe facilities (City walkway, and other designations that it's nowhere close to meeting). Not trying to overcomplicate, but want to point out small improvements.

Response: These networks are aspirational and provide guidance for a future network.

- Question: How can we distinguish these projects and how close they get us to achieving these networks?

Response: We can talk about this next meeting.

- Comment: There are about 5 or 6 changes that need to be made to the routes now that streets like Oleson have sidewalk.

- Comment: Using an Oregon Walks perspective, it's important that projects are built to City standards, accessible to all (equity component), and safe for people to use. To be competitive, we need to make sure that they fit these criteria.

Response: We will have more time to talk about the quality and nature of projects as we get into the scoping/description phase.

- Comment: Using a transportation demand management model, it would be interesting to see how car trips are impacted with the construction of alternative transportation facilities.

Response: Demand is a criteria we will discuss later..

- Comment: Looking at the different networks overlaid makes sense, but it would be great if we could add critical gaps that don't show up in the network. Critical gaps make vital connections for neighborhoods that might be disconnected.

- Question: Will the Safe Routes to School routes have lighting?

Response: Right now the routes are aspirational. PBOT built street projects do need to meet street lighting standards.

- Comment: Important to compare the Regional Bikeway network to the City network.

Discussion of "Gaps and Barriers" Criteria and Measures

- Question: Are you considering micro-connections?
- Comment: The SWIM SWG could come up with the minimum length projects that make sense for filling gaps. It might be hard to combine small projects.

Response: A staff assessment is a good place to start and then we can get feedback about these gaps from groups like SW Trails.

- Comment: Gaps, like Capitol Hwy and 30th Ave, versus Taylors Ferry. There's an important difference to consider. A lot of the gaps are identified in the TSP. Finally, one thing he's hearing from people is that there's some stuff in the plan that isn't right. Some fine-tuning that needs to be done. If we continue to designate things that no one buys into there is no reason to keep things on the maps. There are bike designations that are crazy, will never get used, or will be way too expensive to build.

- Comment: We need to address micro-gaps. Frequent stops are located on safer streets. Safe and better infrastructure would change transit habits on streets like Taylors Ferry, mainly if there was a safe way to get to the stop. There's opportunity to move stops if the infrastructure is in place.

Response: We might have enough time to cover the demand data today.

- Question: Why aren't there more difficult intersections on the "Difficult Connections" map? There are more locations, like Hoot Owl, Barbur/ Naito/ Lane, Boones Ferry, Terwilliger, and Garden Home. So many places that are very unsafe to navigate by bike or as a pedestrian. Hopeful that online map can help address some of these difficult intersections that aren't being captured.

Response: Sounds like the PBOT difficult connections map is missing some data. We'll need to reassess this and get feedback from the community.

- Question: Ride report data can show difficult connections. Does the city have this data?
Response: Yes, although it has some limitations which may not make it suitable for this purpose.

Comment: Crossroads intersection is a difficult one. There are gap projects in the TSP. 823-Safe data could be used to determine gaps or difficult intersections. Reason you can't fix Taylors Ferry has to do with the 40 mph car and bike lane. People coming from Beaverton that are speeding through the area.

- Comment: We have enough projects. There's a need to start looking at how we prioritize these projects.

- Question: Where is the SWNI sidewalk prioritization? Using this would be helpful for boosting projects by considering them a part of the identified network.

Response: Those projects are on the online map.

- Question: It seems like information is not complete, and not entirely accurate. We don't have any time with funding coming up. Do we have a subcommittee to make sure that the information on this map and on the walking map is complete and has been reviewed? We need more input to see if we're using the right data, and need to keep moving along with this discussion.

Response: Projects are not as complete as we would hope.

Discussion of Safety Criteria and Measures

- Question: Where does crash data come from?
Response: ODOT provides the data, which is delayed 6 months.
- Comment: SWIM should tie safety back to dangerous intersections.
- Question: Regarding all this information, if we mapped all the problem areas it would be the whole area. Is this data informing anything? Should we think more about the order of how we do the big pieces of this project? We should determine first where we're spending the majority of our money. Need to think where we should be focusing our attention. What are the focus areas? After we decide on these we can look at the data within these areas.
Response: Some of our data gets to demand and centers, which can look at areas that are busy. These are pieces of the puzzle.
- Comment: Each person should identify bicycle and pedestrian issues in their neighborhood, since the group is so informed.
Response: This could be helpful and we might be able to do this.

Closing General Comments of Criteria and Measures

Note: Continued discussion to take place in the next SWG meeting

- Question: Would people be willing to do homework? We could take an hour when we have time and bring this information to the meeting. This would allow us to talk about the big issues and make some decisions. These issues are too important to spend only 5 minutes reviewing.
Response: Absolutely encourage people to review materials. Sets expectation of people spending that time doing so. First two criteria are the easy ones, so we'll have fun the next meeting talking about all these things. As of right now we have a meeting next month, so we might need to think through some strategies to help us move through this process more quickly.
- Comment: Take some selective conclusions that we've drawn. Run the tool and let us look at what we're seeing, rather than speculative discussions about what we're seeing.
Response: We want to run different scenarios through the tool, but we want to be confident with the measures first.
- Comment: For us it would be helpful to see an example of how the criteria would work with example variables and projects. These criteria and measures could be discussed in the abstract forever. We just need to try running these projects through the scoring process and see how they score. With 5 year prioritization we can only cover select parts of SW. Figure out where we're going to focus our energy.

Response: Share information about the projects before the next meeting. Take a look at the memo from this meeting to provide some reflection on those that we can use when we run the tool.

- Comment: Criteria and measures have 8 categories. We should remove community support from this list. Difficult regarding how this fits into a matrix.
- Comment: Overlapping with other plans = community support
- Comment: Usage level – Areas to focus on include the Centers and Corridors. Projects that are in and connect to those areas will score better city- and region-wide.
- Comment: Reduce 6 criteria to 3. List from his neighborhood about projects that links back to TSP and other city plans. Suggest more homework, and bringing in data from each person's neighborhood.
- Question: Have there been lessons learned from other areas in Portland?
Response: We're wanting to see revisions from people at these meetings. That's why it's hard to just take the same model and apply it to a different area. Through this process we want to pick the top tier that can help us prioritize the correct projects.
Comment: We want to get into the details. Map goes in the right direction.
- Question: Taylors Ferry line markings for bikes is the wrong project. Is this project prioritizing where people want to go, or the product of a vision for a complete network that was outlined years ago?
Response: Almost every street has projects. There will be more refinement through the process of this project.
- Question: Usage – Centers and Corridors are based on where the city wants growth. Why use pixels for jobs and housing growth?
- Comment: Community support – not the most quantitative, but we should take into consideration projects that have a lot of feedback.

5. Next Steps

6:25-6:30 PM

6. Public Comment

6:30-6:35 PM

- Comment: Need to factor in topography to this prioritization process.
- Comment: Scholls Ferry and job growth. Car parking minimums. Lots of land that could be converted. Rebuilding Scholls Ferry to get a bus. Low income homes along Scholls Ferry that need to be factored into this discussion about equity.
- Comments: Criteria – adaptability as a cyclist. Add these alternative routes into biking projects. We need to be able to factor in adaptability. Not as possible as a pedestrian.
- Comment: Biking should be expanded to anything that rolls. Playgrounds with play equipment attract people with strollers. Also, you have a whole network of

neighborhood organizations who could give you priorities and public opinion about projects. Utilize the neighborhood organizations.

Adjourn

** Light snacks will be provided for committee members*

** Bus tickets will be made available to committee members who need them*