

**Bicycle Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**City Hall, Lovejoy Room**  
**6-8:00pm | February 12th, 2019**

**BAC Members Present:** Rithy Khut, Elliot Akwai-Scott, Christopher Achterman, Clint Culpepper, Catherine Gould, Iain MacKenzie, David Stein

**BAC Members Absent:** Reza Farhoodi, Sarah Iannarone, Alexa Jakusovsky, Phil Richman, Alexandra Zimmerman

**PBOT Staff Present:** Roger Geller, Corrine Montana, Owen Slyman

**Other Attendees:** Marvin Rambo, Eric Wilhelm, Zoe Rothberg, Fiona Yau-Luu (Bird), RJ Shepherd, Jonathan Maus

**Guest Presenters:** April Bertelsen (PBOT), Briana Orr (PBOT)

---

**I. Introduction & Announcements**

- a. I-5 Expansion
  - i. Extended comment period: 45 days, mid-February through March
- b. Update from Budget Advisory Committee
  - i. Passed on providing comment on PBOT's current budget
  - ii. Sarah: budget update coming

**II. 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Plan: Safety, Access, and Transit**

- a. Goals:
  - i. Increase safety, improve pedestrian & bicycle access, and support better transit while balancing needs of freight and other modes
  - ii. Identify improvements to help eliminate serious injuries and fatalities
  - iii. Maintaining the status quo is not acceptable.
    - 1. Safety is a major concern
    - 2. Most of 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue does not meet new crosswalk spacing guidelines (every 800 ft or every 530 ft in a pedestrian district)
    - 3. Does not adequately serve all modes
- b. Outcomes:
  - i. Develop a multi-modal safety conceptual investment plan
  - ii. Identify a subset of priority project improvements to build with \$3.3M of Fixing Our Streets and other immediately available funding
- c. 122<sup>nd</sup> is also a potential candidate for regional flex funds
- d. 122nd Ave. TriMet Partnership
  - i. TriMet commitment: provide Frequent Service along 122<sup>nd</sup> Ave, Bus Line 73

- e. Personal mobility lanes – bikes & scooters
- f. Questions:
  - i. Will crossings be signalized?
    - 1. Response: Still being determined for each location; treatments may differ depending on context.
  - ii. Catie (question about presentation image): Prioritization or type?
    - 1. April: Prioritization, will add label to slide.
- g. Timeline: currently developing and evaluating alternatives
- h. April: The conditions and uses along the corridor vary. North has more industrial uses; mid-span is more commercial, and south is more residential.
- i. Potential 2020 Project Improvements
  - i. More street lighting
  - ii. Additional pedestrian & bike enhanced crossings
  - iii. Signal changes
  - iv. Transit priority treatments
  - v. Protected or enhanced bike lanes
  - vi. Access management (median barrier to prevent left-turns (and left-hooks))
  - vii. Relocate utility poles for better sidewalk environment
  - viii. Bus stop improvements
  - ix. Manage speeding and red light running
  - x. Pursue speed limit reduction
- j. Pedestrian Crosswalk Spacing Standards
  - i. Generally no more than 800' between marked crossings
  - ii. Proposed additional crossings along 122<sup>nd</sup> to meet those guidelines
- k. Enhanced Transit on 122<sup>nd</sup> Ave.
  - i. 122<sup>nd</sup> (NE Shaver – SE Powell) accepted into the Regional Enhanced Transit Corridors (ETC) Pilot Program
- l. Range of Alternatives
  - i. Alternative Group 1: Converting Travel Lanes
    - 1. Convert outside lanes to Bus And Turn (BAT) lanes, protected bike lane, remove parking
    - 2. Convert outside lanes to buffered bike lanes, retain curbside parking
    - 3. Convert outside lanes to parking and protected bike lanes
    - 4. Convert outside lanes to wider sidewalks by moving in curbs, parking and protected bike lanes

- ii. Alternative Group 2: Maintaining 5 Travel Lanes
  - 1. Remove parking to provide protected bike lanes
  - 2. Remove parking to provide bus/BAT lane and buffered/protected bike lanes
- iii. Alternative Group 3: Removing One Lane (in area of rail undercrossings)
  - 1. Remove northbound lane and reallocate space to elevated 2-way multi-use path on east side of street
  - 2. Remove southbound lane and reallocate space to 2-way bike path on west side of street. Elevate bike lane on east side and combine with sidewalk.
- m. Next Steps
  - i. Summarize/consider public feedback
  - ii. Evaluate alternatives
- n. Questions
  - i. Question: Do we have different policy goals for different segments? Do we want to change the character of the south section or maintain it?
    - 1. Response (April): Looking at comprehensive plan.
  - ii. Question (Rithy): Is it going to be residential or freight focused?
  - iii. Question: How much has ridership changed since implementation of Frequent Service?
    - 1. Response: Not sure. Will find out
  - iv. Comment (Catie): 122<sup>nd</sup> could be a model street mix. Bus should be a priority.
  - v. Question (Catie): Does center turn lane need to exist? Can we meet Vision Zero with this many travel lanes?
    - 1. Response: These will be part of the consideration of alternatives. PBOT looked at concept of removing left turn lane through use of hook-turn lane, in which a motorist would drive past the intersection and, at a mid-block signal, make a U-Turn to return to the intersection, where they could then turn right.
  - vi. Question (David): What would bus stops look like?
    - 1. Response: Different possibilities depending on the alternative selected. Have not determined yet.
  - vii. Question (David): Has PBOT looked into pricing parking?

1. Response (April): Don't think parking utilization is at a level that would benefit from pricing parking.
- viii. Question: Where are on-street parking hotspots?
  1. Response: On-street parking located mostly where there are apartment buildings. Heightened sensitivity to those hotspots.
- ix. Question: What about lowering the overall speed limit? Or a "driveway diet?"
  1. Response: Currently considering as part of alternative evaluation.
- x. Comment: Would like to de-prioritize left-hand turns as they are the source of many accidents
- xi. Comment: Consider a pedestrian/bike scramble at signalized intersections
- xii. Comment (Elliot): step back, big picture, funding, 2020: smaller improvements
- xiii. Comment: Reduce travel lanes, prioritize bus travel, reduce parking where possible

### **III. E-Scooter Report**

- a. Context: In 2018, PBOT ran a 120-day pilot program for the testing of E-Scooters.
- b. Goals of the pilot included:
  - i. Assess the potential of a new transportation option
    1. Reduce private motor vehicle use
    2. Reduce injuries/casualties
    3. Expand access for underserved communities
    4. Reduce pollution
  - ii. Data Sources
    1. Company-provided availability, trip, collision, complaint data
    2. User survey
    3. Multnomah County Health Department
    4. Online form
- c. Pilot Facts and Overview
  - i. 120 days
  - ii. 801,887,84 total miles
  - iii. 5885 average trips per day
  - iv. Longer average trips in East Portland

- d. Findings:
  - i. 71% of surveyed users said they used e-scooters for transportation
  - ii. Heavy usage at evening peak
  - iii. 34% of e-scooter trips replaced either personal driving or ride-hailing trips
  - iv. E-scooters attracted new people to active transportation
  - v. 62% of Portlanders viewed e-scooters positively (Higher for low-income communities, communities of color, people under 35)
  - vi. 44,000+ trips in East Portland
  - vii. Reduced comfort for people walking
  - viii. Improperly parked scooters negatively impacted accessibility for people with disabilities
  - ix. Low company performance on equity goals; not enough scooters were placed in East Portland, though companies were required to do so
  - x. E-scooter-related injuries: 5% of total traffic-related injuries during pilot period
- e. Next Steps:
  - i. January: public engagement
  - ii. February: draft administrative rule and permit
  - iii. March: solicit and review permit applications
  - iv. Early Spring: launch 1-year pilot program 2.0
  - v. 2020: recommendations
- f. Questions:
  - i. Question: How does injury rate compare with those of other transportation modes?
    - 1. Response: Bicycling generally has higher reported injuries but it is difficult to compare apples to apples as we do not have trip data and thus cannot determine rates
  - ii. Question: Any data on miles driven by those who picked up and charged the scooters?
    - 1. Response: No data.
  - iii. Question: Hospital admission data?
    - 1. Response: That data is in the E-Scooter report appendix
  - iv. Question: Is the use by residents or for tourism purposes?

1. Response: 1000 non-Portlanders took the survey and had lower mode shift rates. Specific data available on users in appendix.
- v. Question: Changes planned for the next permit round?
  1. Response: Not ready to discuss yet; however, questions and comments can be submitted during online open house on Friday 2/15. Minor example: publicly available data.
- vi. Comment (Catie): Should eliminate caps on number of scooters.
- vii. Question (Catie): Why another pilot program?
  1. We still have a number of questions for e-scooter companies as well as how best to manage the program. Still evaluating how best to gather and evaluate mobility data.
- viii. Comment: Using mobility data standards as used in Los Angeles
- ix. Comment: This should make us think more about making bike facilities multi-modal.
- x. Comment (Elliot): This is a huge opportunity to use all the data we have for first/last mile opportunities. Also, an opportunity to introduce people to non-vehicle modes. Bike facilities should be multi-modal.
- xi. Comment (Rithy): We are very punitive toward these companies. We should regulate cars the most – more deaths and serious injuries. We should incentivize these scooter companies
- xii. Question: Is geo-fencing possible to regulate speed limit based on location (i.e. parks)?
  1. Response: Possible in a larger area (like a park), but not precise enough to regulate on sidewalks vs. streets, for example

#### **IV. Committee Business**

- a. Rithy: Discussion over makeup of the committee – need to determine which type of committee BAC will be (Type I vs. Type III)
- b. Differences:
  - i. City council vs. bureau head appointment
  - ii. Potentially different rules followed in the committee
  - iii. Difference in who committee advises (Bureau Head v Council)
- c. Question for city attorney: can we have a site where online committee business can be done publicly, similar to the freight committee?