

**Staff Responses to Stakeholder Working Group Comments
on Prioritization Criteria - Safety**



SWG Member Concern	PBOT Staff Response	Status
<p>I would support giving a "point" for a project if it is a Metro identified caution street OR a street with a crash history. I would not, however, support giving two points to a street if it is a caution street and has a crash history. My rationale is that there are many unsafe places to bicycle and walk, such as Marquam Hill Road, that aren't shown as caution streets, so it is unclear to me that it is a terribly accurate measure.</p>	<p>The scoring will not double up points as described. Instead, roads deemed difficult for bike connections will serve as an extension of locations with crashes. It should be noted, all of Metro's difficult connections intersected with at least one segment of the SWIM high crash network.</p>	<p>Addressed</p>
<p>Some streets with higher traffic levels and speeds and curves and/or narrow lanes would not be good for any improvements and possibly should not be considered for any improvements. Some streets that could provide alternative routes should be given higher consideration. Some safety locations can be addressed by AC improvements and some locations should be avoided as use will always generate conflicts and the safety issues could be addressed by communication oriented efforts.</p>	<p>Community members may advocate for alternative routes in the next round of public comment. Identifying an alternate routes would be particularly helpful if the prioritized route does have construction feasibility problems.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>As I mentioned at the March 1st meeting, higher traffic speeds and volumes on collector streets in SW Portland are "suppressing" bike and pedestrian usage, which in turn lessens the number of crashes involving these modes. The auto crash map is not an adequate stand alone proxy.</p>	<p>The latest approach uses Metro's "Caution" street identification to augment our crash data for streets with suppressed usage. Extending the dangerous connections to segments with crashes captures some of the streets like Dosch Rd that were mentioned at the March SWG meeting. We continue to use auto crash history in our analysis, but value walking and biking crashes further.</p>	<p>Addressed</p>

SWG Member Concern	PBOT Staff Response	Status
<p>I support the idea of adding the Metro bike information. I believe that for most streets in SW, which don't have sidewalks or bike facilities, the Metro bike route rating would generally be comparable to what pedestrians experience. The only difference I can think of is when there are sidewalks, but no bike facilities, the ranking for pedestrian quality would be higher than for bike.</p>	<p>Metro bike data was incorporated and difficult bike connections were also deemed unsafe for pedestrians when sidewalks are missing.</p>	<p>Addressed</p>
<p>To me, Safety is unquestionably the most important factor. Some comments: When was the Metro Bike map updated last? I am wondering how current it is. It doesn't seem like the Bike and Pedestrian Caution Streets completely correlate. Here are a few examples where the Bike Caution streets do not so closely relate to Pedestrian ones: 1) I see that Vermont between 30th and 35th is a designated Caution street, yet that stretch has a new sidewalk for great pedestrian access. In that case, it might not be great for bikes but it certainly is good for pedestrians (at least on one side of the street). 2) Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy where the street turns from dark blue to green on the map as it nears Hillsdale Town Center. While there is currently a painted bike and pedestrian lane there, due to the speed of the traffic and the amount of traffic going in many directions there, it definitely does not feel safe for bikers or pedestrians. 3) The stretch of SW Capital Hwy between Vermont and where the shops in Multnomah Village starts is by no means a safe stretch. It's ok in that that it does have a very narrow bike lane and sidewalk. But, due to the narrowness and the speed of traffic, it is not a very comfortable place to walk or bike.</p>	<p>According to the metadata, Metro's Bike data was last updated in August 2016. Examples like the Vermont St sidewalks will not rise to the top because there are no projects there. Looking at safety concerns through the qualitative lens will follow after we run the preliminary analysis. Our hope is to bring the first round of prioritization scores the SWIM SWG to get feedback regarding how well our tool is capturing safety concerns.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

SWG Member Concern	PBOT Staff Response	Status
<p>So, I question some of the standards that the map is using for safe routes. On the other hand, the Caution street designated for 30th from Beaverton Hillsdale Hwy to Hoot Owl Market/SW Capital Hwy is definitely accurate. It seems that the Caution streets are alerts to potential problems, but each need to be looked at ON THE GROUND - both from the perspective of a pedestrian AND someone driving in a car trying to avoid a pedestrian (sometimes pedestrians don't realize how in each case how dangerous walking there really is). Though looking at maps and statistics is important, NOTHING substitutes for being on the ground at a location and actually testing a route. Is there a plan to visit all the areas noted before making any decisions?</p> <p>Also I want to make a few notes here about the limitations of Crash Maps being the main measure for Safety criterion: 1) As someone mentioned at a past meeting, there are many near misses that are not entered into the data. 2) Pedestrians avoid streets that are very dangerous (even if it means going out of their way) which leads to less pedestrian crashes. So the data may be sqewed. 3) In general, when looking at the crash maps, I still do not see that they reflect certain intersections or stretches of road that people visiting on the ground would agree are extremely dangerous. The crash maps are helpful and informative but should not be the only or main method of identifying Safety needs in the SW. Other factors - especially site visits by planners, etc. to all the locations - should be part of the process before projects are chosen.</p>	<p>For the first pass analysis there are not plans to visit all streets to verify. As individual projects are identified and selected, site visits are often necessary.</p> <p>The inclusion of Metro caution streets is intended to reflect some of these concerns of reliance on crash history only.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>If the Metro info about caution streets is added, I think it's solid.</p>	<p>This will be added.</p>	<p>Incorporated</p>

**Staff Responses to Stakeholder Working Group Comments
on Prioritization Criteria - Usage**



SWG Member Concern	PBOT Staff Response	Status
<p>Some destination such as walking a trail of it is not in a park just for that purpose get missed with this approach. Example 4T Trail is in itself a destination.</p>	<p>Not all possible or valued destinations are included. There is an opportunity to advocate for individual projects during public the next public comment period. If a project scoring doesn't seem accurate (for example, proximity to the 4T trail), advocacy can help elevate a project ranking.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>I support measuring density of use in some way, and if this tool is the only reliable one, than I guess I support it. I just find it odd that the OHSU/VA campus is SW Portland's most densely developed area, most significant employment center, and a significant destination for health care services, and yet it appears to have less "usage" than many other areas of SW Portland...</p>	<p>Density is a key measure included in the complete neighborhoods analysis. Other important demand generators are also included. Staff consider this measure to be a good way of capturing the varied interestes and demand generators across southwest. There is an opportunity for you to advocate for projects that you feel are the most important and would serve places like OHSU.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Technical issues - the maps were not scaled at enough detail for SW to really see what was going on and see where actual schools, stores, parks etc were in our understanding and perception of our neighborhoods which we, the residents, know very well. It was also difficult to really compile in my head what the data meant.</p>	<p>These maps were developed by BPS, meaning we don't have original copies of the map. We could provide more detailed maps if you want to see the individual factors that make up the scoring.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Usage measures must include Strava public data (https://www.strava.com/heatmap#15.00/-122.70395/45.50030/hot/all) and, in the future, City of Portland subscribed Google, Apple and mobile carrier data. The City of Portland can cooperate with ODOT and Metro on subscriptions.</p>	<p>Strava data is valuable, but suffers from a documented selection bias. Our emphasis is in estimates for latent demand, rather than documentation of existing demand.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

SWG Member Concern	PBOT Staff Response	Status
<p>As discussed on March 1, consider including scored access to elementary and middle schools in addition to high schools, I'm not clear how sloped areas >20% and <20% score in this category as that seems to be more of a constructability/cost consideration, and access to parks should distinguish between urban parks (e.g. Gabriel) vs open space/natural areas (e.g. Tryon Creek and Marshall Parks).</p>	<p>This measure is supposed to point us in the right direction. BPS has spent the time research their methodology and we feel that it captures usage within SW.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Do not use the composite score. Instead, evaluate the data layers since some are more useful than others. Some would double count criteria (such as slope), others are irrelevant (sidewalks, all yellow), and others need to be weighted (such as parks).</p>	<p>BPS is the owner of this data and we don't have access to some of the datasets. The use of the composite score is intended to communicate the varying and distinct destinations valued by different community members.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>This measure seems biased to favor the neighborhoods that have established business districts, ie Hillsdale; Multnomah and along Barbur Blvd. Nearby residents deserve improved access to these businesses and destinations but the lower density neighborhoods should not be penalized. Also, the city wide comp plan maps are not a helpful or usable reference for consideration of the criteria.</p>	<p>The demand measure is intended to identify areas with mixed use development, concentrations of destinations, and relatively higher density of housing. Lower activity areas are included in this analysis, acknowledging the presence of businesses, schools, parks and other amenities. During public comment period the public and community groups can advocate for specific projects and revised scoring results.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>While I'm comfortable with this as proposed, I feel it misses one key consideration - longer distance bike connections. For example, Hewitt shows up as low usage due to the lack of density and destinations. However, it is a key, and well-used bike connection between Sylvan and destinations east. We need to remember that bike trips in SW will tend to be longer than other parts of the city due largely to the lower density and distance to commercial and institutional destinations.</p>	<p>Streets like Hewett will get captured by both the pedestrian and bicycle networks being used. During public comment period the public and community groups can advocate for specific projects and revised scoring results. For example, articulating the utility and destinations a route can connect to is a great way to advocate for more priority in the usage criteria.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

**Staff Responses to Stakeholder Working Group Comments
on Prioritization Criteria - Equity**



SWG Member Concern	PBOT Staff Response	Status
<p>I think we need to identify a basic level of service needed across the entire city. When facilities fail the level of service then it. Does not matter if those failed are poor, black white or rich. The city has a responsibility to remedy the missing service to get it to that level.</p>	<p>We share the vision of providing complete facilities across our city. This analysis factor is only used to help pick which to build first.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>The People of Color metric should be entirely dropped. Many people of color are wealthy. For this measure, city policy should be focused on opportunities for less wealthy. In this case supporting other than personal vehicle transportation for the SW neighbors.</p>	<p>The burueau has a commitment to racial equity from the top of the organization. See PBOT's Equity Matrix to learn more: https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/74236</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>This shouldn't be given more priority than usage level unless employment centers, schools, etc are taken into account since vulnerable populations need to get *to* somewhere by biking/walking/transit. If we focus only on places where vulnerable populations live without including their destinations, I worry that projects won't connect a usable network for people starting trips from those places.</p>	<p>There is an opportunity to adjust weighting before we run prioritization.</p> <p>The results are first pass, and will be adjusted so that it can support a connected network.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>I would appreciate quantified ranges that represent the scaling from Low to High for each of the relevant categories, but agree with the data sets and appreciate PBOT's efforts to provide most current and granular data available.</p>	<p>Each prioritizations criteria has a score ranging from 1 to 5.</p>	<p>Addressed</p>
<p>I like the use of census block data but don't like composite scores. Some location scores didn't make sense to me and I, too, worry about margin of error. It would be helpful to have the locations of low-income apartment complexes such as those owned by Home Forward.</p>	<p>Staff have developed revised equity measures to offer a more detailed look at the census data. This should provide a more accurate snapshot of which blocks and streets are serving vulnerable population groups.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

SWG Member Concern	PBOT Staff Response	Status
<p>I support the criteria recommended for assessing priority of these projects. However, I don't view Equity as a separate priority. I believe that equity plays into several of the existing factors, ie. density and usage. Perhaps if there were some secondary factor that covers something like prioritizing projects in parts of the city that have been under funded, maybe these would be more likely to occur in under privileged parts of the city? I strongly disagree with using this as a priority on its own. It makes the majority of people feel ignored!</p>	<p>See PBOT's Equity Matrix to learn more: https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/74236</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>As you mention, getting more fine-grained information would be helpful. For example, the Council Crest neighborhood shows up as having a significant disadvantaged population. Hardly! If we could all be living hand-to-mouth like those poor folks. We may be best off relying more on the knowledge of the committee members and common sense to refine this further. If we can't, perhaps this should be a second tier criterion/consideration.</p>	<p>Staff have developed revised equity measures to offer a more detailed look at the census data. This should provide a more accurate snapshot of which blocks and streets are serving vulnerable population groups.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

**Staff Responses to Stakeholder Working Group Comments
on Prioritization Criteria - Pedestrian Network**



SWG Member Concern	PBOT Staff Response	Status
I think the connections to the network may be some of the most discouraging barriers for walking and transit. e.g. Miles and Barbur / 3rd, side streets with no sidewalks connecting to a major thoroughfare.	This is something to think about as we move forward with the project.	Noted
Pedestrian Districts are left off these criteria. Add them and it will go a long way addressing the needs of the most dense areas. Some important routes are not shown because they are not presently usable. The major trail network should be reviewed before moving forward.	Pedestrian Districts are a component of the PedPDX network and will be incorporated. Will follow up regarding what important routes are not shown. Also, would be interested to hear the revisions about trails.	Noted
Seeing where we have pedestrian walkways already and where we have current projects scheduled would help define where the highest need for walkway improvements might be. I would love to see those SRTS on the maps along with the locations of the schools.	Safe Routes to School will be incorporated because they are a part of the pedestrian network for PedPDX.	Addressed
The SWIM process should not prioritize already built routes. This is a very major issue and discussion topic.	Already constructed routes won't have projects on them. These were filtered out during the project compilation. If we've missed anything, it would be helpful for SWG members to let us know.	Noted
Considerations as noted from long discussion at Mar 1 SWIM SWG mtg. Takeaway for me is that the evaluation needs to address system gaps and deficiencies for pedestrians regardless of whether the best project is directly on an adopted network or addresses a gap that may provide a more safe and comfortable connection than the facility included on the adopted ped network.	These are adopted networks, or networks that will be adopted, that will help to complete the network in SW.	Noted

SWG Member Concern	PBOT Staff Response	Status
<p>The three networks are not comparable and the scoring should not be whether it's one or two or three network. The scoring should weight the networks since TSP walkways and transit streets should be weighted much higher than trails, which may not be safe or accessible to all street users nor lead to a destination.</p>	<p>Our revised network will do a better job of taking into consideration major streets.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Urban trails should not score equally / have the same weighting as a designated city walkway, unless the trail will be built to full city standards, meet ADA requirements and be accessible to all regardless of abilities in any weather or time of day (ie meets lighting standards). I compared the walkway maps carefully for this survey question. On the composite walkway map, there are network segments that receive a score of 3 (red) that are on arterials and collectors, such as SW Capitol Hwy, Taylors Ferry, Garden Home Rd, etc but others that are only residential streets like SW Troy that need no improvements and the rank of 3 (red) makes no sense, especially if they rank higher than nearby arterials and collectors that lack sidewalks or paved shoulders. The busier streets clearly need pedestrian improvements more than residential streets.</p>	<p>These classifications are being revised with the PedPDX priority network. We can assess changes to the network now that we have a better sense of how urban trails will compare to streets.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>I support this with the additional information you mention that will be added when available.</p>	<p>The PedPDX network is now available and will be added for prioritization. It also incorporates the Safe Routes to School.</p>	<p>Incorporated</p>
<p>I have the hardest time responding to this one because without the other two maps, it's hard to do a "smell test" on it. I suspect it will work out well, I just don't know. At the same time, I don't know any other way you would be able to map these ones.</p>	<p>We can share copies of the most up-to-date PedPDX priority network and Safe Routes to School at the next SWIM SWG.</p>	<p>Incorporated</p>

**Staff Responses to Stakeholder Working Group Comments
on Prioritization Criteria - Bicycle Network**



SWG Member Concern	PBOT Staff Response	Status
This network needs to be reviewed especially for passage through parks. Some park related routes are totally infeasible.	None of the projects should be cutting through parks, despite the network going through parks. Thus, scores from the network passing through a park won't impact the scores.	Noted
SWHRL strongly objects to the omission of SW Fairmount in its entirety, and especially between Marquham and Talbot, the Marquham climb to Fairmount as a priority route, SW Montgomery between Vista and 13th, SW Cardinell, SW Humphrey, SW Dosch, SW Patton and Broadway Drive between downtown and SW Scholls Ferry Rd. and SW Chesapeake. SWHRL strongly believes that Strava data should guide bike route priorities. SWHRL supports our fellow neighborhoods along the same line.	These comments will be taken into consideration.	Noted
More explanation is needed regarding the differences (from SWIM Bikeways map legend) between City Bike Plan projects and City Bikeways (others).	City Bikeways with projects are segments that have projects on them to build to 80% of the network from the Bicycle Plan for 2030. The remaining City Bikeways make up the 20% that aren't captured by projects.	Noted
In general I doubt if we have time to revisit the Bike Plan but some of the designations need to be revisited.	This is beyond the scope of this project.	Noted
This looks fine. The only additional consideration would be to allow for some fine-tuning to a few of the routes shown because they are misguided and/or totally impractical. This could be reflected in the SWIM plan and used to guide future TSP amendments.	This might not be within the scope of this project, but we will have time to take a look at these routes after the prioritization.	Noted