

8/11/18 PAC Summer Meeting Notes & Recommendations:

On 8/11/18 five members of the PAC met to discuss aspects of our participation with the PBOT PAC. Our discussion focused on the role of the PAC according to [PAC Bylaws](#) (available in our PAC membership binders and listed [online](#)).

In short, the PAC's role is to review, advise, promote, and monitor PBOT and City Council on projects affecting pedestrians.

- We reviewed the intention of the PAC and discussed how we are fulfilling the items listed under Article I: Purpose of the PAC Bylaws. **We found that the PAC currently is not fulfilling many of its intended objectives.** We found that most of our work as a PAC has focused on reviewing projects, but in a somewhat disorganized and unaccountable way.
- We **explored various operational adjustments** that the PAC can use to make our meetings more efficient and to help us better fulfill PAC bylaws.
- We were also realistic about the limitation of a 2-hour meeting to fulfill the many objectives listed in the bylaws. If we're unable to fulfill the current objectives, we discussed the need to review and adjust the bylaws to better reflect the PAC's role and its duties.

Below we've identified four main action areas addressing the operational challenges we see the PAC is currently experiencing. We describe both the challenges and our proposed solutions for each area.

There are a few additional points to explore listed under item 5, Other Points to Explore.

1. Project Rosters:

Challenge:

We feel that we often we get a single chance to review a project, and offer feedback, but have no way of knowing if our feedback has been considered or implemented.

We're unclear about:

1. *how the projects the PAC reviews are selected.*
2. *what the specific project criteria are for projects to come to the PAC.*
3. *when in the design process projects come to the PAC.*
4. *how we can keep track of the feedback we've provided.*
5. *how our work relates to PedPDX.*

Proposed Solution:

Set up an ongoing Project Roster for PAC-reviewed projects that documents our feedback and is updated with project status in response to our input.

2. **Presenter Checklist:**

Challenge:

Every presentation the PAC receives is different in coverage and content, making it difficult to understand the scope of the project and offer meaningful feedback.

Proposed Solution:

We recommend presenters use a standard outline that includes the following items:

- **Budget & Timeline:**
 - Funding sources and cost of the project
 - Approval status
 - Project timeline

- **Context:**
 - Problem the project will solve
 - Current status of project development
 - PAC feedback sought. (Is the presentation informational or is the PAC evaluating and reviewing project options?)

- **Pedestrian Impacts:**
 - Pedestrian Pros and Cons
 - Community involvement to date and in the future

- **Next step processes:**
 - Determine how and when the presenter will evaluate our feedback
 - Determine how and when the presenter will follow-up with the PAC on the project status

3. **Project Evaluation Rubrics / Surveys:**

Challenge:

We feel that the PAC is a largely reactive body that primarily offers opinion-based responses to the presentations and projects that we review. Rarely do we receive updates on the feedback and comments given by committee members or the public.

Proposed Solution:

We would like to establish a standardized and quantifiable process for PAC project evaluation to help the PAC collect, organize, review, and incorporate the our feedback in a more formalized way than our current feedback process.

We recommend PAC Members use a Project Evaluation Rubric at the time of presentations to evaluate the projects brought to the PAC for review. We envision the rubric following the same format as the objectives listed under the PedPDX Draft Mission, Goals, and Objectives document. PAC members would evaluate projects using a scale of 1 to 5 on the following areas: Safety & Security, Comfortable & Inviting Ambience, Equity & Inclusivity, Public Health, and Environmental Health.

We found this checklist to be thorough and in line with PAC objectives. Using this checklist would also help the PAC make its evaluations according to the larger objectives of the city-wide PedPDX Plan.

4. An improved public comment process:

We recommend **having the Public Comment session held at the beginning of meetings instead of at the end to honor the public's time.** The chair could determine the number of people who want to speak, divide into 15 minutes, and give them their opportunity to address the PAC.

We identified the need for a feedback loop regarding public comments by setting up a system to get back to our public commenters regarding next steps, offering thank you acknowledgements, etc.

5. Other points to explore:

a. Build a relationship with new PBOT Leadership:

We would like the PAC establish a relationship with new PBOT director, Chloe Eudaly, to discuss pedestrian-specific issues with her and hear her take on these as well.

b. Design Toolkit Wishlist:

We would like to create a document in the PAC's Google Drive of an ongoing and participatory PAC Design Toolkit "Wishlist" sharing our favorite design tools and policies we believe could help support the development of the PedPDX Design Toolkit and address specific pedestrian issues of concern to the PAC and its members.

c. Citizen Input

To better fulfill **Section 4 of the PAC Bylaws on Citizen Input:**

We would like to invite other pedestrian stakeholder groups and organizations to present their pedestrian-oriented experiences, challenges, and concerns with the PAC and ways the PAC can help address their needs.

Some stakeholder groups and organizations include:

- o Disability Rights Oregon
- o Elders in Action
- o Safe Routes to School
- o No More Freeways PDX
- o Guide Dogs for the Blind
- o The ARC > For the developmentally disabled
- o Representatives from PDX Neighborhood Associations
- o Oregon Walks
- o The Street Trust
- o Culturally-specific groups and organizations.