

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 #5

Meeting Notes

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

Community Room at Stephens Creek Crossing

6715 SW 26th Ave

Members of the public are always welcome!

1. Welcome and Introductions (includes public) 4:45-4:50 PM

Discussion was opened for public comment. Only one member of the public was present and they had no comments.

2. Public Engagement Update and Online Mapping Tool 4:50-5:10 PM

Nick discussed all the public outreach that's been completed. There was also a brief update regarding the online mapping tool and the amount of feedback it's gathered.

Question: Anything you're hearing right now from these focus groups?

Answer: We've been asking about the top priorities and considerations related to the evaluation criteria. W

We've also heard about specific locations and needs. The Markham school meeting identified the need for an improved crossing near Markham school. The Orthodox Jewish population stressed the need for improvements within their community Eruv boundary area.

Question: Has there been much connection with renters in higher density areas (B-H Hwy, Barbur)? Are they getting represented?



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.

Answer: The SWIM team will make note of that. Nick has reached out to some of the apartment complexes, but he hasn't heard back. The team also did a big mailing with project fliers.

Question: Have you looked into addressing the carless retirement communities in Hillsdale and Maplewood?

Answer: We will look into this.

Question: Are we going to see the results from the Wikimapping tool?

Answer: Yes, once after the comments are processed, which will happen after it closes on March 16.

Question: Hillsdale Market is a place where lots of people go and come together. Good place to reach the walking and active transportation community (3,000+ people).

*SWIM SWG member agreed that this was some volunteering that they could do.

Question: Neighborhood house would be a good place to set up. Does the mapping tool tell where the comments are coming from?

Answer: Does connect to an email address, but not a physical address.

Comment: Neighborhood House only distributes to two houses, so it'll be biased.

Response: The SWIM outreach approach is a concerted effort to reach different populations and groups. Our communities do not need to be, and often are not, geographically balanced.

Question: Regarding public engagement, could we work in any of the grant programs to get demonstration projects? Namely, Portland in the Streets.

Answer: After we have a better sense of the project further along in the planning process. This could be part of the future implementation plan.

3. Prioritization Measures and Variables

5:00-6:30 PM

Conclude discussion on prioritization measures

Draft prioritization criteria were presented to members of the SWIM SWG. Members raised concerns about some of the data sources that are being used.

Question: Is this a generic list?

Answer: Looking for overlapping criteria. Today we're going to talk about individual measures and eventually look at how projects score. This is a first pass to identify the top priorities.

Question: There's nothing in the stated objective which says it's focused on active transportation.

Answer: We can go fix this. It's just assumed this is a known fact with this group, but thank you for the reminder.

Question: Are we going to go through and look at how things scored before voting?

Answer: We'll look at the source, demonstration, and then how projects scored based off criteria.

Question: Where do neighborhood greenways fit into this?

Answer: Low speed, low traffic that are supposed to be comfortable for biking. Not a designated network, so they aren't necessary included here.

Comment: Neighborhood greenways are important projects that would help get kids off busy streets (safety issue).

Comment: Consider giving a project a score if you're on *any* network, not just overlapping networks.

Answer: This is a good comment, and something to bring up as a part of our discussion for each criteria.

Question: What are we going to do with this information? Is it going to be a rough guide to help us make a more subjective decision?

Answer: Yes. This is the first pass that's supposed to help us identify projects that are the most important. Not meant to be the final answer. It's not perfect, it can't be perfect. We hope it's pointing us in the right direction.

Comment: We need to have the data so we're basing the decisions on reality.

Question: The networks seem to still be apples and oranges because there isn't regional walkway or major city walkway. It isn't fair to have these higher levels because they don't exist for pedestrian classifications. Concern that projects serving a vital connection aren't showing up right now (Hoot Owl Corner).

Answer: The network criteria is one of four. This isn't intended to capture all important attributes. For example, the safety criteria would help bring hoot owl corner higher up than some other areas.

Comment: The pedestrian network is missing important sources - Trail 2 (RE should be on there), 4-T should be on there, 2 regional trails (Hillsdale-LO, Willamette Greenway). Also, access to employment should be higher scoring. Trail 1 should help address the problem comparing Marquam Hill Rd to access to OHSU using this difficult path.

Comment: Inner Fanno Creek - another trail that's missing

Question: How to the Transportation System Plan 1-10 year projects fit into this prioritization? Why isn't that one of our layers to give points?

Answer: The TSP 1-10 year and other project lists will be a part of our prioritization. They will receive the evaluation.

Comment: Walking along transit routes, not to transit routes. Should think about how Southwest Urban Trails connect to transit routes.

Response: Source layer in Usage that we might get to in this presentation.

Comment: Confused about the number of networks we're considering.

Comment: Don't like the networks that were decided on years ago. Humphrey - 2 pt and Hewett - low score, but would be much better for walking.

Answer: The SWIM SWG will have a chance to take a look at all the projects after they're run through the quantitative approach.

Comment: Weighting doesn't make sense. Should be 1-4. Transit could be weighted frequent (3), regular (2), and commuter (1).

Response: Transit a function of demand. We can consider this type of weighting.

Comment: Humphrey and Hewett example. Pursuing Humphrey is not the right approach. Collector street always get prioritized higher over local street. Hewett could rise to the top when we get to construction feasibility. Maybe we should create an updated network that takes into consideration all the work that people at PBOT have already done.

Answer: These concerns are probably addressed by some of the other criteria, which will help the score of these projects.

Comment: Walking network is close, but bike network is far from complete. Bike network needs to be complete to make a trip, while pedestrian network has work arounds.

Comment: Starting with the network map was the most complicated of the criteria. Walking is complicated and people do it for different reasons.

Comment: The different network layers are not clear, and the scoring is not clear.

Ped Network – Want to be able to tell why something is a 2 or 3. Need to have city walkways and transit routes memorized to understand where they overlap. Concern that trails will be scored as highly as city walkway and doesn't consider what some people can't access.

Answer: Projects we're prioritizing are projects that are built to PBOT standards. There might not be any projects along these lines, but if there are they would score higher.

Comment: Maps should be in color. Safe Routes to School (SRTS) needs to be factored in. We can't make any decisions without these vital connections to schools.

Answer: SRTS planning practice is so close. We don't want to undermine them and show. They will definitely be a part of the prioritization.

Comment: We need to see the regional connections on here as well. Bikeways that connect to Oleson Rd – we should be feeding in to this (Fanno Creek connects to this).

Comment: Some streets that are extremely unsafe to walk and people don't even use them.

Response: Is there a proxy to gauge this?

Comment: Dosch Rd – might not score high for safety. People drive fast and over 4,000 cars a day.

Comment: Parks is good except that a lot of parks in SW are traverse by streams. Need to work with BES to know where BES is willing to maintain trails.

Comment: Understand that we need to rely on data. Recognize we've criticized the measures. The fault of past projects.

Comment: Need to make distinction versus developed park and non-developed park.

Comment: Safety – High traffic speeds and volumes are suppressing the crash data. Find a way to overlay this with the bike and pedestrian network to see what's going on there.

Comment: Some streets are what we call; "Suicide roads" – need to figure out how to get into the data for speed and volume. Like the usage level approach for capturing the what if.

Comment: Underlying data – There are details in there that could be removed, including sidewalk presence. Speed and volume data should be overlaid. Car crashes should be used as a proxy.

Comment: Supports coming up with traffic volumes and speeds, with Hewett and Dosch being an example. Point data looks at a small part of the problem. Flow chart would be helpful for letting the SWG know how all this data will be used. Share some of the information from these meetings so the SWG can get a sense of what's being said.

Comment: Weighting different things is a good approach, but we need to split out the layers. Need to use the most recent sidewalk data. Not a good proxy for usage. Should look at the 9 layers used in the slide and weigh differently.

Question: Why does BPS's data not include middle schools?

Comment: Agree with safety and need to gauge suicide roads. Metro took a good look at this.

4. Next Steps

6:30-6:35 PM

Nick briefly discussed the direction of the project and materials that will be sent out in the next week. This will include the source layers that were used to make the maps in the most recent memo.

5. Public Comment

6:35 PM

Comment: Parks are a good destination to include in the prioritization except that a lot of parks in SW are traversed by streams. Need to work with BES to know where they are willing to maintain trails.

Adjourn

** Light snacks will be provided for committee members*

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