



711 SE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97214
(503) 230-9862
www.altaplanning.com

MEMORANDUM

To: Gabe Graff, City of Portland Bureau of Transportation
From: Katie Mangle, Alta Planning and Design
CC: Catherine Ciarlo, CH2M
Date: January 9, 2018

Re: CCIM Draft Project Decision-making Criteria

The purpose of this memo is to outline a set of decision-making and evaluation tools for the Central City in Motion project. These include:

- Project Goals
- Low Stress Bicycle Network (armature) planning principles and criteria
- Pedestrian Network Projects planning principles
- Multimodal project prioritization criteria

Project Goals

For context, the CCIM project goals are outlined below. The project goals provide a critical foundation for the network development, project identification, prioritization criteria, and performance measures.

1. Support the City's Vision Zero action plan by prioritizing investments that **make conditions safer** for people walking, biking, and taking transit and for people with disabilities.
2. Preserve and increase vitality in a growing Central City by **making travel easier and more accessible**, especially for people who walk, bike, and take transit.
3. **Reduce drive alone trips** in the Central City as a way to use limited space more efficiently and make travel more reliable; design a system that helps achieve the City of Portland's Council-adopted mode split goals for walking, biking, and transit.
4. Support the city and region in meeting the Climate Action Plan goals for **greenhouse gas reductions**.
5. **Increase economic vitality** and ensure equitable transportation access to Central City jobs and services.
6. Better **serve people experiencing mobility challenges**, particularly those dependent on the transit system to meet their most basic needs.
7. Ensure that **goods and services can access** the Central City reliably.

Priority Low Stress Bikeway Network: Planning principles and criteria

Per Task 4.4, Alta developed a list of bikeway network planning principles and supporting network design criteria. Per Task 5.6, below each network planning principle, criteria are listed to help the team create and evaluate draft Armature Network (a network of priority low stress bikeways).

COHESIVE: The network is intuitive, easy to find, easy to follow, and provides connections to destinations throughout the city.

- provides 1/2 mile (approximately 10 block) minimum spacing
- provides bi-directional, easily identifiable travel in a corridor (considers the one-way grid)
- connects the central city quadrants to each other

DIRECT: The network gets people to and from major portals and destinations without out-of-direction travel.

- provides access to each side of the bridges with bicycle access
- connects the top bicycle portals into the central city with regional destinations (PSU, Providence Park, Rose Quarter, commercial core)
- provides access to major transit hubs

SAFE: Improves locations in the central city that have a high crash history or known safety issues.

- addresses known crash risks (from PBOT's High Crash Network and CCIM Safety Analysis), or
- avoids the most dangerous intersections (where the design solution this project could achieve *would not* sufficiently address the safety issues)

COMFORTABLE: Low-stress facilities/separated bikeways are needed to attract more users and achieve mode split goals.

- provides a comfortable experience for all users through application of traffic diversion, traffic calming, physical separation, and signal modifications
- creates a uniform or predictable pattern of traffic movements, as allowable within the constraints of this project
- promotes active, well-utilized environments to deter negative behaviors (harassment, violence, and other perceived safety concerns)
- advances positive outcomes for vulnerable/underrepresented/marginalized groups

HIGHLY IMPLEMENTABLE: The network could be implemented in the near term (within 5 years), achieving the objectives of the Central City in Motion project.

- coordinates with the 1-5 year TSP projects list
- does not rely on long-term or unprogrammed investments (e.g. the Clackamas bicycle/pedestrian bridge)
- leverages existing facilities (connects the existing low stress facilities to each other)
- avoids or considers conflicts with the emergency services network

Pedestrian Network Improvements: Planning principles and criteria

Per Task 4.4, Alta developed a list of planning principles for identifying priority improvements to the pedestrian network.

- **COORDINATE WITH OTHER PLANS:** Coordinate with and build upon the City’s TSP project list, Multimodal Mixed Use Area Inventory, Vision Zero analysis, and PedPDX Crossing Gap Analysis
- **ADDRESS MISSING CROSSINGS:** Focus project funds on improving locations that do not meet the City’s draft minimum crossing standards:
 - At least every 530 feet on Central City Transit / Pedestrian Streets
 - At least every 800 feet on City Walkways
- **ADDRESS DEFICIENT CROSSINGS:** Improve pedestrian crossings with features that improve pedestrian safety, e.g., decreasing crossing distance.
- **FILL CRITICAL GAPS:** Identify other critical access improvement needs (transit access, etc.)
- **MULTI-MODAL:** Along the priority bikeway corridors, identify where the bikeway project would also make substantial improvements to the pedestrian network

Preliminary Project Prioritization Criteria

After identifying a set of recommended projects for improving biking, walking, universal access, and transit in the central city, the project team will help the community prioritize investments. Prioritization criteria will be used to set investment priorities. The 5-year prioritized multimodal project list for Central City will include:

- Tier 1: projects to be built with existing funds
- Tier 2: projects to be built in 5 years, funding to be identified
- Tier 3: projects outside of the 5 year horizon

The following list of prioritization criteria is a preliminary list for discussion and consideration as the project team develops the priority multimodal networks and improvement projects:

Would it provide multimodal benefits?

- Implementing the project will also improve conditions for other active modes as well. (Provides a “2-for” or “3-for-1” benefit.)

Would it make travel safer?

- Improves locations with a high crash history (identified in the Vision Zero analysis) or locations with known safety issues (identified in the CCIM Safety Risk Analysis).

Will it be effective (attract more people to walk, bike, and take transit)?

- The project will increase person throughput
- The project will make the facility comfortable for all ages and abilities.

Will the expected benefits exceed negative impacts?

- Improves access to the central city for residents in Communities of Concern.
- Maintains truck freight movement for local access to and within the central city.
- Maintains emergency and utility access to and within the central city.

Other Prioritization Criteria Considered (for reference only)

Functionality

- Improves ease of travel in the Central City
 - Increases the person throughput of the corridor/ quadrant.
 - Improves reliability of person throughput
- Increases level of comfort for people biking, thereby improving bicycle access for a wider range of people.
- The project has multimodal benefits: implementing the bikeway project will also improve conditions for pedestrian and/ or transit movement as well.

Reliability

- Addresses a top bottleneck for transit reliability.
- Maintains truck freight movement for local access to and within the central city.
- Maintains emergency and utility access to and within the central city.
- Provides a robust network for travel.
- Provides predictable travel times.

Equity and Sustainability

- The network has high benefit relative to negative impacts. Provides improved access that outweighs negative impacts, or that can reasonably and efficiently be addressed/mitigated
- Improves routes that provide bicycle access from outer neighborhoods to the central city.
- Improves access to the central city for residents in Communities of Concern.
- Addresses perceived safety concerns for vulnerable communities.