

City of Portland  
Pedestrian Advisory Committee



NOTES

Tuesday, September 18, 2018  
6:00 – 8:00 PM

Portland Building, 1120 SW 5<sup>th</sup> Ave, Pettygrove Room (2<sup>nd</sup> Floor)

Committee Members:	Alternate Members:
Brenda Martin + Elaine O'Keefe* Brian Landoe* Mark Person* Patricia Jewett* Evelyn Ferreira* Zoe Klingmann* Matthew Hall* Kenzie Woods* Josh Channell* Tiel Jackson* Josh Roll Janine Gates Ashley Schofield* Elka Grisham*	Don Baack Kelly Reid* James (Jim) Fairchild* Marcella Crowson+ Andrea Peruzzi Kevin Glenn+

\* Indicates committee members in attendance

+ Indicates committee member excused

Staff Present: Michelle Marx, Denver Igarta, Francesca Patricolo, Kerry Aszklar

Special Guests and Speakers: None

## Introductions/Announcements

The Pedestrian Advisory Committee meeting began at 6:01. No members of the public were present. Michelle Marx was welcomed back after leave.

### Hot topics:

Topics included new PBOT vision clearance guidelines, the Center City in Motion open houses, updated statistics on e-scooters and next steps, follow-up from the I-5 Rose Quarter presentation in July, and upcoming agenda topics.

#### New PBOT Vision clearance guidelines

Michelle covered new PBOT vision clearance guidelines that entail requirement for capital projects and new development to have 20' clearance at closer crosswalk. This does not apply to residential streets, but it applies to all arterials. These guidelines are also part of the PedPXD toolbox.

Josh asked about the implementation of the policy. Michelle responded by saying it will not be retroactively applied but applied moving forward. Elaine asked if they will investigate with this new policy in line, and Michelle replied by saying, with 823-SAFE complaints, they will evaluate.

Patricia asked if the guidelines will be applied to the St. John's strategy and remarked that project has been postponed and delayed. Michelle responded that she will reach out to that project manager.

Josh asked if the setbacks will be assigned setbacks, and how will people know that it is 20'? Michelle replied, setback will be applied with 20' or with sign. Michelle commented that with that space, you can apply bike corrals or curb extension, and if you still think there's a visibility concern, you can call in.

Tiel asked what kind of barriers exist to implementing these guidelines. Michelle replied that there are primarily financial barriers and brought up the example of the financial challenge of changing the speed limit signs because of the recent change to 20 mph. Francesca remarked that it's also in relation to work orders and staff capacity to fulfill work orders because they are booked for the foreseeable future.

There was a question regarding if this be put on the list for the future so that the last parking space could go away, or yellow striping be put down. Michelle replied saying there is no currently developed plan with retroactively removing spaces. She continued by saying, if the Committee want to recommend that to staff, then she can take that information back. Additionally, another reason to do this incrementally is political, and mentioned the concern of pushback if two parking spots were removed on every block.

Elka asked if there was information from Vision Zero regarding this setback. Michelle replied by saying she talked to Vision Zero, and it's a hard factor to include; she mentioned that we don't have data to point do because this knowledge is known anecdotally. She commented that this was done on Hawthorne.

There was a comment about possible low-budget solutions for neighborhoods with low-income, with packed parking blocks and bike accidents and pedestrian crashes. Suggestions included sending out email notification and letting residents know by mail. Michelle replied that she wants to reach out to staff to see what we can do with communities of concern. Francesca commented that we are starting to think of creative solutions in the PedPDX plan.

Elaine commented that from a survey regarding parking in her dense neighborhood with narrow streets, feedback included the challenge of concerns by drivers and pedestrians, in addition to how drivers are concerned about parking in this area. She also commented that business districts do not want to lose parking in their commercial zone. She concluded by saying it is a complicated situation, and that the “it’s political” comment should be kept at the forefront of minds.

#### Center City in Motion Open House

Michelle commented that this is a follow-up item from the visit from Gabe Graff, the Project Manager for CCIM. She commented that he’s taken feedback and asked for needs to be voiced. He has identified specific projects for the \$30m project budget.

#### Updated Statistics on E-Scooters and Next Steps

Josh opened up the topic by asking who has ridden one, and who has had a less than ideal interaction with scooters. Michelle pointed to the one-pager provided as a short update from PBOT on e-scooters with data. Briana Orr, PBOT staff member who oversees the e-scooter program, asked to return to committee in Dec. for feedback and comments on policy and guidance.

Elain asked if there is any geographic information with this. Michelle replied that she will ask. Tiel asked if there is any analysis from the data provided here, and Michelle responded that Briana will do an analysis once the pilot is over in November. There was a brief conversation about how e-scooters seemed to have been embraced in Austin for short trips in a downtown area, and those trips would otherwise be in cars. The conversation included comments that in Portland, those trips could replace trips by transit or bike.

Kenzie commented about the relation between e-scooters and air pollution, and questioned where they are getting charged, how much energy they are using? Etc. Tiel followed-up by asking how much it costs those who pick up scooters by car. Tiel also commented about the low-maintenance training for those who re-charge the e-scooters and suggested a city-created program to train them and give credentials.

Josh commented that Portland has been very forward in doing a pilot program for e-scooters, and his scooter trips have replaced walking, biking, driving, and transit trips. He commented that he is looking forward to hearing more about it in December. Someone brought up the public health aspect of e-scooters. Josh commented that he has seen people not using helmets. There was an additional comment about the conflict between the convenience of the scooters and the requirement to use a helmet. Elaine commented that as the PAC, there should be focus on the impact of scooters on the pedestrian environment.

#### Follow Up from the I5RQ Presentation in July

Michelle opened up the discussion to ask for follow-up comments and questions from the presentation in July. She said that Taylor Phillips, interim Pedestrian Coordinator, reported that there may not have been as much discussion or committee discussion on the I5RQ; there was some public comment at the end of the meeting that members of the PAC didn’t have the chance to reply to.

Someone commented that a follow-up conversation with the program managers would be great at a future meeting. Michelle replied that she can reach out to the project team and asked for any specific comments or concerns. Elaine mentioned that some people had very specific concerns with the design and the history of the project, and that was not something that was shared with the committee. She commented that she felt like the committee was given a sanitized version of the project and was not comfortable until more information was given. Tiel mentions that while they did not attend the meeting, the Fair Housing Council has information on the Rose Quarter and what was there before, and that would

be a big extension. Brian commented that the Environmental Impact Statement will be released in January, but that there are historical aspects that were not covered in the presentation. Michelle commented that when the draft is released from the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, she will reach out to the project management team. Josh commented that it will be an environmental assessment, not an EIS.

#### Upcoming Agenda Topics

Elaine announced that she represents the PAC on the PBOT Budget Bureau Advisory Committee, and that meetings are starting up again. She commented if anyone was interested, that she'd be happy to give the position to another.

Tiel remarked that they'd love to see data on the smart sensors along Division and other high crash corridors.

Another person commented that the conversation on what role neighborhood associations have should be brought up again.

Another member commented on the N PDX neighborhoods and Commissioner Eudaly, with PBOT and ODOT presentations.

### **Topic One: Connected Centers Street Plan Denver Igarta, PBOT**

Denver Igarta opened the presentation by explaining the Connected Centers Street Plan and explained that he is asking for feedback from the Committee that he will take to BPS staff. He explained that the plan focuses on centers, and uses the Jade and Rosewood neighborhoods as examples presented in the plan. The process is tied to another plan, the Better Housing by Design plan, that focuses on multi-family housing. He is going to Council early next year (no date set yet).

Denver further explained the Connected Centers Street Plan by stating the problem. He said these areas struggle with connectivity as well as sidewalks and paving. These neighborhoods are developing as they are filled in, and Denver stated that PBOT wants to make sure that they are done right. These areas are seen as pedestrian-focused. Denver stated that there is code that mandates the requirement to have connected and safe right-of-way. The problem addressed is that large blocks have longer travel distance and fewer route options; this forces people to walk on a busy road and encourages driving. He went on to say that a big issue is the difficulty of getting connections to fit on these lots that are very narrow and very long. Denver pointed out that the purpose of the project is to analyze the Jade and Rosewood neighborhoods, and pointed out that the Jade neighborhood is bordered by high-crash corridors.

Denver asked, how can we get better outcomes, such as more trees, more community values, while also providing the density we need in these areas? From this question, Denver commented on proposed solutions they presented to the community.

Proposed solution: Make new connections feasible more often.

Denver brought up these comments from the community:

- Instead of street connections, maybe path connections could help. The community voiced the concern that street connections still put a lot of traffic on arterials.
- Long, narrow blocks that are over 1,000 feet don't feel attractive.
- People of color feel less comfortable if a space feels like private property.

- Denver brought up how the plan looked at a phased approach to get these streets to match as they develop, and that approach is possible with 20 or 24 feet of ROW

Comments from the PAC:

Evelyn asked if changing the zoning to allow for more commerce to encourage more pedestrian use had been considered. She commented that she envisions this as a bike path rather than the end result being a street for cars. Additionally, Evelyn commented that allowing for more commercial zoning will fill in the needs of the neighborhood.

Denver replied that he agrees. He also responded that when we approached communities and say we want to put in walkways to daycares or daily needs, the community said that's not here yet. Denver notes that we're trying to acknowledge the current state while we work towards this idea of a pedestrian center.

Brian asked, would these streets be paid for by developers? Denver replied that they're already required to build them.

Elaine asked for clarification by saying, the objective is to get the ROW to the point of development, and that's not happening because the current ROW standards do not accomplish. Getting ROW is the bottom line. Denver affirmed her clarifying statement. Elaine continued and said that from personal experience where streets that were not allowed to cars, then opened up to traffic, that transition did not go well. She also commented that the Fire and Rescue Bureau must be your ally.

Tiel commented that she was thinking of allies and doing it midblock to have interconnected plazas having connected spaces. She commented on less thinking about the grid and more about the accessibility. Denver replied that our vision for these streets is to be car-light.

Josh stepped in and mentioned that they were over time. Next steps included a visit again from Denver in Spring 2019.

## **Topic Two: Facilitated Group Discussion: Committee "Visioning" Francesca Patricolo, PBOT**

As a result of the shortage of time, original plans for a committee "visioning" were altered. Francesca introduced herself, explained her current purpose for attending the meeting, and applauded the group for getting started on this "re-visioning". She invited Evelyn and other committee members to get started by reading the list of challenges and recommendations.

Evelyn commented that she was happy to see small changes incorporated already, such as starting the meeting with public comment rather than waiting until the end. She brought up four key points to streamline concerns and came up with possible solutions.

Challenges:

1. Project rosters - only get single chance to provide feedback, but no way to see if feedback has been incorporated.
  - Solution: get ongoing project roster of all PAC review projects with committee feedback given. This would allow for new members to follow history of a project.

2. Presenter checklist - every presentation is different from coverage and content.
  - Solution: recommend that presenters use standard outline, including project timeline, budget, content, current status of project, and PAC feedback from history, pedestrian pros and cons, future, next steps
3. Project evaluation rubrics and surveys for PAC -
  - Solution - establish standardized and quantify review to incorporate feedback in standardized way. Evaluate scale of 1-5 on various topics, including public health, environmental health, and others.
4. Improved public comment process - recommend public comment at beginning of meetings. Identify need for feedback loop
5. Other points to explore: build relationship with new PBOT leadership
6. Design toolkit wishlist
7. Citizen input - invite other pedestrian stakeholder groups to voice their experiences, challenges, and concerns at meetings

Due to concerns about time, Francesca suggested each person be allowed to speak. Some committee members voiced concern about increasing this list. Francesca noted that many committee members had comments and began the activity by going around the room.

Jim commented about the vague role of the alternate and has been hesitating to speak as a result.

One member commented that on-boarding idea is good; a larger on-boarding process is good to explain what our role is, what our place in the city is. Once you're on the PAC, member said, things are different. Process-wise, regarding this conversation, this member said there needs to be another time to have this conversation.

Ashley commented that there needs to be more time to go over recommendations. She said her role has been to listen and learn and will eventually bring in her own experiences and concerns. She also suggested a "101" educational session for members.

Kenzie commented that the groups work was great, and that challenge/solution to #2 is a good idea. If people were given a standardization or tell presenters that they need to hit these points, that'd be great. In SWIM and with other pathways, she commented, they say that it's more expensive, but she brought up the point that SW PDX brings in more taxes.

Evelyn emphasized the rubrics and project evaluations.

Tiel commented that they support all the recommendations, especially #1, 2, 3. She underscored the idea that the Committee is opinion-based, while they've asked about data, and asked and evaluate projects. Another point she made is that they are a review-based body but are not asked for input.

Josh emphasized listed challenges and solutions. He also voiced concerns about a project manager boiling down a project that they've worked on for years and putting a rubric in front of the public.

Brian brought up point of different learning and interacting styles, and that a rubric can be beneficial for those who are not as loud and not comfortable speaking in groups like this. He ended by saying a tool to facilitate that is important.

A member asked, is there a way for PAC committee to address citizen groups? To satisfy activists? Member pointed out that PAC doesn't hear controversial points.

Elaine raised the point that nothing bad was said about current leadership. Pointed out that PAC is passive, but PAC hasn't clarified what they'd like to focus on, and it would be worth the time to talk about that. For example, e-scooters were not brought before the PAC until pilot was rolled out, and e-scooters are a huge pedestrian issue. Commented that projects are important to get PAC input on. Commented that difference between public input and public involvement should be clarified. Comment that she does know how to put idea or project on table - no mechanism to do that. She noted that the PAC can be more effective and questioned if it's worth the time to come to PAC meetings without having a well-defined role and process.

Mark agreed with challenges. He also voiced that he was an alternate at the beginning and also wasn't sure if he should voice his opinions. And getting input before project is at 90% development is important.

Francesca suggested the next step to take these concerns, come back with a draft of what was heard, get additional ideas, open the door to that conversation, in addition to getting staff together to think critically about concerns that were voiced.

Josh said they could carve out time next meeting, and Michelle commented that it's not unprecedented to add on 30 minutes to a meeting. Josh said he didn't have an issue with that. Elaine commented to maybe hold November's meeting open, since it's open now. Josh asked for show of hands to support this idea.

Josh also commented to alternates that he encourages and expects them to participate, and that the only time they are precluded from participating is when there's a specific vote on an issue.

Meeting adjourned at 8:03 pm.

#### References & Resources mentioned in the Presentation

Connected Centers Streets Plan (PBOT)

Better Housing by Design (BPS)

I-5 Rose Quarter Plan (ODOT, BPS, PBOT)

PedPDX (PBOT)

PBOT PAC Summer Meeting Notes and Recommendations

E-Scooter Pilot Program (PBOT)