Joint Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee Meeting
June 12th, 2018
Lovejoy Room, City Hall
6:00PM – 8:30PM

PAC Members + Alternates in Attendance:
Brenda Martin, Elaine O'Keefe, Patricia Jewett, Evelyn Ferriera, Zachary Katz, Matthew Hall, Kenzie Woods, Josh Channell, Tiel Jackson, Josh Roll, Ashley Schofield, Elka Grisham, Jim Fairchild, Felice Kelly, Marcella Crowson, Zoe Klingmann, Kevin Glenn

BAC Members in Attendance:
Rithy Khut, Elliot Akwai-Scott, Christopher Achterman, Jim Chasse, Clint Culpepper, Ira Dixon, Joe Doebele, Maria Erb, Reza Farhoodi, Catherine Gould, Alexa Jakusovszky, Jenna Lee, Iain MacKenzie, Phil Richman, David Stein, Alexandra Zimmermann

PBOT Staff in Attendance:
Roger Geller, Taylor Phillips, Michael Serritella, Caitlin Reff, Teresa Boyle

Introductions & Announcements (6:00 – 6:15)

Josh Channell orients the combined group and establishes basic norms for participation given the size of the combined group in attendance

Division Transit Project (6:15 – 7:25)

Michael (TriMet) gives a brief overview of his presentation and provides background for the Division Transit Project (DTP).

Key elements:

- 15 miles of Bus Rapid Transit
- Federally Funded "small starts"
- Represents a change in how we operate along the corridor - BRT will replace "Line 4" - Currently 42 stations (83 platforms)
- Station spacing is about ⅓ mile apart (how TriMet gets improved frequency by consolidating bus stops). TriMet makes a commitment to a 15-20% reductions in travel times
- Currently moving from 30% to 60% design
- Construction begins at the end of the next, with a planned opening in Fall of 2022.

The route will utilize existing infrastructure downtown to OMSI - from there to the end of the line there will be new infrastructure including signal timing, station typologies, and business access.

A main question is how to integrate stations into the existing urban fabric - much of it is about extending to the travel lane.

TriMet explored protected bike lanes + stations (in the Outer Division area), but ran into feasibility issues and issues with access, sightlines, and right-of-way acquisition. Established a goal of "staying within the ROW". To expand beyond the right-of-way creates a "cascade of challenges".

DTP assembled a stakeholder committee (TriMet, Metro, PBOT, Alta, WSP, PIVOT, Advisory Committees, etc) to further explore options that could be scaled regionally.

DTP established three Design Criteria:

1) Safe
2) Accessible
3) Replicable

Operating Assumptions:

1) ⅓ Mile Station Spacing
2) Low Bus Dwell Times (20 seconds)
3) Bus stops when requested (and/or patrons at stops)
4) 32 Bicycle Platforms at protected bike lanes (primarily between 82nd and 182nd)
5) Bikes stop for pedestrians

Michael (Trimet) reviews two options they initially looked at:

- Bikes in lane option (problem 'dwell times and business as usual'; and
- 2) Bikes behind station option (problem 'no established rules and sightline issues)

Alta (Steve Durant and Derek Abe) discuss design alternatives for stations

Alta representatives begin by discussing precedents (Toronto, Ontario & Seattle, Washington). They then move on to their primary design concepts and variations for the "bikes behind step-out" design:

- 5' step out, 3' bike, 11' sidewalk,
- 5' step out, 4' bike, 10ft sidewalk.
- 2' step out, 5' bike lane, 12' sidewalk (with the buffer of the bike lane roughly matching the step out area).

  Question: "Is the stop sign intended to be used every time or just when a bus is there?"
  Response: - "We would recommend that they stop every time that there is a bus - when there's no bus, the expectation could be that you stop or yield, but that's the type of feedback that we're looking for. The bike could yield if there wasn't a bus there."
  Question: "Can you go over the frequency/volumes?"

Response: "Frequency is ~6 minutes during peak, ~12 minutes during on peak volumes is higher at connecting stations."
Question: (Tiel Jackson): As someone who commutes by bus, it is her preference to not wait at the sidewalk/shelter, but at the loading area closer to the curb. Reasons: 1) habit, 2) peak hours - getting a good seat, 3) - I don't think I'll be seen in the shelter.
Response: - What about this design would alleviate your concern?
Comment: - If you had a two-foot step out and a three foot bike lane, I would feel that I was closer to the curb.
Response: one of the issues about a narrow step out space is about boarding and alighting - are you going to always look for bicyclists?
Comment: but they're supposed to stop.
Response: They're supposed to stop, but what could happen if they don't? We try to address that. In particular, the lift ramp (~4ft) would be deployed into the bike lane. Although bikes are supposed to stop, we realize that this is a dynamic environment.
Comment: Catherine Gould - This is a lot like the stop at the Hawthorne Bridge - the bike lane is narrow and people don't really stay within the bike lane. The grade separation could be really important. People don't really stay in that place, I think green paint is not going to do it. I would recommend that we drop down the bike lane and raise up just at the crosswalks.
Comment: I would think that it would be wrong to assume that bikes wouldn't stop.
Comment: Ian - It seems like there are a lot of potential conflicts with this design. It seems like this is a really expensive project (compared to Rapid Ride in Seattle). It's becoming a hugely expensive project and to keep it on budget, you're sacrificing bike/ped elements. What about it is so expensive?
Response (TriMet) - there are a lot of elements that are expensive compared to the Seattle example because we are applying these designs to an ageing corridor that is in need of more work to upgrade it to current standards. The signals in particular are one example of the more costly elements of the project.
Response (Wendy Serrano) - this is something we'd like to talk more about - please connect with us.
Comment: Kenzie Woods - I don't see a huge difference between the 5ft and 2 ft design. I don't think people are going to follow the directions. Americans are not going to follow the rules - Maybe do a test and observe the extent to which people comply.
Response: Derek - I should clarify that we've looked at a number of American locations and have done a lot of observations.
Comment: I think setting up some pilots and doing some observations is helpful.
Comment: Kevin Glenn - I kind of like the 'curving element' of the bikeway that signals to me as a cyclist that I'm entering a cautionary zone.
Comment: Christopher Achterman - the 5' gives a little more space for stepping out, and 3' signals to bikes to slow down - what if we had some kind of visual cue for grade separation to remind people to slow down.

Comment: Evelyn Ferreira - I nanny a lot and imagine taking a bunch of kids in a cargo bike. A three foot bike lane is just super narrow. I think it's important to think about future increases in bike lane usage along this corridor. I think that keeping it green throughout is not a good idea. Maybe using signals and/or other technology to get bikes to yield.
Comment: Elliot Scott - I think the context for each station is important for yielding behavior - the Hawthorne bridge is not great example because you're heading into downtown. I think that using signals is a really good idea - not sure how much more it would cost. I would strongly recommend against any type of vertical separation - I think it would create safety concerns for people walking, biking, and accessing transit.
Comment: Josh Channel - there's a lot of interest and I recommend that the PAC (and BAC) get these comments in writing.
Comment: Derek - What if instead of a solid green, we used some kind of pattern to imply that there is mixing that is going to happen in this loading area. In terms of tactile, we are beholden to ADA and required to use it (required to have yellow truncated domes along the entirety of the loading area). One things we've considered is a 'directional indicator' - the intent of which is to provide more of a way to lead folks to a crossing. We've also looked at railing, raised curbs, station design, etc. Also signage (on street, small signs, or potentially on the bus).
Comment: Elaine O'Keefe - my main concern is the conflict between users - I don't think paint is going to do it (it fades and is only effective in the daylight). I'm concerned about all users (parents with kids, older adults without good vision). One thing that struck me is the 'school bus' model - lighting that indicates that people should stop. Flashing lights on the bus would be my recommendation.
Comment: David Stein - I really would encourage more than 3ft for the bike lane. I haul my kids on my bike and even 8ft can feel narrow depending on who is sharing the space. Yield signs are better than stop signs at stations. Please consider the ability to maintain the bike lanes so that it can be cleaned out.
Comment: Elka Grisham - Is having the bus trigger some kind of signal something that you're considering as a possibility. I would suggest it very very strongly.
Comment: Marcella - I think it's important to consider setting rules for one street in Portland and not considering how the rules would be applied in other areas of the city. I think we're already facing an education challenge to train people on how to behave on that street.
Response: Derek - One of the central goals of this project is to be consistent in this corridor and then have those rules applied to other ETC's.
Comment: Jim - Is it going to be easier to retrofit a RRFB/Hybrid Signal to work with ETC enhancements? Wouldn't be best to upgrade to whatever would work best with enhanced transit?
Response: We are coordinating with the Outer Division Multi-Modal Safety Project on the location of these types of pedestrian crossings, among other project elements.

Comment: Katherine - I don't see what would discourage a pedestrian from just wandering into the space. I think it's worth doing a pilot program on the Hawthorne bridge to see how people comply with and experience this type of design - let's just try it out and see if it works.
Comment: Josh - We are sort of in uncharted territory here - there isn't a lot of experience with this. With that we'll definitely put together a letter. What is the timeline when you'll need comments?
Response: TriMet - It would ideal to get it by the end of June. The design development doesn't stop, but the intense design development we're doing with Alta does wrap up soon.

TriMet (Wendy) – Reminds group about open houses on June 27 and June 28.

BAC/PAC makes motion to write a joint letter.

Southwest Corridor Project

Teresa Boyle (PBOT) gives some context for this project. SW Corridor is looking at a light rail alignment that would go from downtown Portland to Tigard and Tualitin via the Barbur / I-5 corridor. The project would include multiple park and ride locations, as well as a number of bike/ped improvements around the corridor to improve access to transit. It is budgeted at $2.6-2.8 billion and is projected to see 43,000 daily riders in 2035. Public comment opens June 15th and will go through the end of July.

Short Term Timeline:

- DEIS public review – Mid June - July
- Steering Committee selects LPA - Mid Aug
- City Council adopts LPA - Sep/Oct
- Metro adopts LPA and updates the Regional Transportation Plan – Oct/Nov.

Overall Project Timeline

- 2019/2020: Project development, 30% plans, FEIS
- 2020: Portland and partners commit local match & voters decide on regional funding
- 2022: Construction starts
- 2027: Light rail opens for service

The DEIS is a long document with multiple appendices that describes all possible alignments being considered, identifies significant impacts, compares this project to a no-build situation, and identifies ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate significant impacts.

The big choices to be made in Portland are whether the line will be along Barbur the entire way south of I-405, or if it will be on Naito north of the intersection at Barbur. There is also question as to whether part of the alignment will be adjacent to I-5 or on Barbur in south Portland. At this point, the alignments are simply footprints and no further design has begun. They are not planning on removing travel lanes on Barbur, but will widen the road to add rail, sidewalk, and protected bike lanes.

The Initial Route Proposal (IRP) used for this DEIS includes:

- Mall south: Barbur not Naito
- In Woods: Separate LRT bridge with space for multi-use path.
- Terwilliger to BTC: Barbur
- From BTC to City Limits: on a bridge adjacent to I-5

The IRP is NOT the locally preferred alternative (LPA). The LPA will be selected in mid-August by a steering committee and adopted by City Council.

LPA with light rail on Barbur would leave Ross Island bridgehead access unchanged. Project partners are pursuing bridgehead improvements in conjunction with LRT. Improving the Ross Island Bridgehead will create ped crossings of Naito, provide bike facilities on Naito (Barbur to Harrison), create opportunities for infill housing, and provide a better vehicle throughput for 26W-26E and better access to/from I-5 and Barbur.

Anthony Buczek from Metro takes over to discuss some of the details of the DEIS.

Anthony discusses the many constraints with the current configuration of Naito and the Ross Island Bridgehead. The neighborhood is currently cut in pieces by Naito and the many ramps to I-5 and the Ross Island Bridge. There are limited bike and pedestrian facilities in the area, making it nearly impossible to get around, let alone in and out of this part of town. The Naito/Bridgehead route option would create safe spaces for walking and biking on Naito as well as reconfigure the bridge ramps, making it easier to get to and from the bridge.

Anthony then goes into the transportation findings of the DEIS. Some key high-level points include

- None of the alignments were eliminated from consideration, but there were many mitigations recommended, some of which are cost-prohibitive
- There will be a substantial increase in corridor mobility, with 43,000 average daily riders projected for 2035, better biking and walking connections, and a slight reduction in congestion due to this mode shift.

The DEIS did three types of analysis to determine conditions for walking and biking in any of the scenarios, including;

1) Network completeness
2) Network comfort - pedestrian and bike LOS (Multimodal LOS)
3) Marked Crosswalk Frequency (from PedPDX work)

The DEIS concluded that the project would improve conditions for each of these analyses for both walking and biking via added sidewalk and bike lanes, new connections, and many added crosswalks.

Anthony concludes by reminding the group that the DEIS and supporting documents can be found on swcorridorplan.org and encourages us to submit comments online and attend open houses on June 26 at Markham Elementary and July 12 at Tigard Town Hall.

Question: Rithy - what is the process for taking input from all of these sources and developing a LPA?

Response: Chris Ford (Metro) - Any comment submitted will get federalized (a response is required for every substantive comment). In the short term, there's a steering committee and they will make a recommendation on August 13th. Comments related to choosing a recommendation will be summarized and given to the steering committee for consideration. Comments related to choosing an option will be used for the DEIS.

Comment: Teresa (PBOT) - *encourages PAC/BAC to submit a letter and outlines future opportunities for engagement.*

Question: Kenzie Woods - NEPA question - I'm not understanding the relationship between the bridgehead project and the light rail - how does the EIS capture that.

Response: Chris (Metro) - we studied three options... If an alignment is chosen to be on Naito with the bridgehead option, it allows the project to be eligible for federal funding.

Response: Teresa (PBOT) - We are getting environmental clearance to make it immediately eligible for funding.

Comment: David (BAC) - I'll encourage anything you can do to fix Naito - I don't really care if it has light rail or not. I don't really understand how mode share impact will be felt beyond transit. I don't see how the improvements will impact biking and walking. I don't really understand why all travel lanes are being retained. I don't see how it aligns with the Comp Plan and TSP. Spending a lot of money so we can maintain traffic lanes for cars.

Response: Anthony (Metro)- Part of it is we don't have great tools to estimate the change in biking and walking that will occur. We think that putting improved facilities on Barbur will increase mode share. Our modeling ability for walking/biking is very limited.

Response: Teresa (PBOT) - To be clear, this is an FTA facing document and vehicles and transit are what they most care about.

Comment: David (BAC) – I would like to revisit the question about why we're not removing lanes.

Response: Teresa (PBOT) - There isn't a lot of road network in SW - If you limit Barbur, you're going create a lot of diversion - you don't have a network to absorb it.

Rithy moves to extend the meeting.

Comment: Committee member - It seems like there's a lot of money in this project, things are moving from 95% terrible to 50% terrible. Should we ask for something more than that?

Response: Anthony (Metro) - Crossing deficiency is a little overstated, there are lot of sections were there are no destinations. But these comments are what we're looking for - the more specific you can be the better.

Response: Teresa (PBOT) - There will be continuous sidewalks and bike lanes where there is light rail on Barbur

Comment: Phil - Confused and concerned about Newbury and Vermont bridge. Concerns about further west into Tigard - issues on bridges - confused about travel lanes not being removed and how this is going to be safe for bikes.

Response: Teresa (PBOT) - The conversation around the N&V bridges has evolved quite a bit since we began this process. We think it's a bad idea to just leave those viaducts as an unimproved item. ODOT is looking at bringing some money to address those issues on those bridges. My recommendation is to make a comment about those concerns online.

Question: Clint – regarding the 80% to 50% "terrible" facilities - What type of improvements are we going to get? I'm looking at renderings and seeing designs that aren't up to standards and not what we're asking for. 2013 is when ODOT denied us to improving the viaducts. 2027 is when this project will be completed. That's a 14-year gap, we need to make improvements now - we have dangerous conditions now - we need to make those improvements at the beginning of the project.

Question: Tiel - Have these viaducts been assessed for seismic safety.

Comment: Megan (ODOT) - we know that they need to be upgraded or replaced for seismic safety - we're looking at an opportunity to leverage federal/state/local investment to make those improvements.

Comment: Rithy - I wanted to gague the interests of the committees in writing a letter about his issue, and further, and who would be the respective members of each group who would write the letter.

Comment: Elaine O'Keefe - I would focus on deciding if we have a strong interest in discussing an alignment.

Rithy - Asks the group if people would want to volunteer to write a letter.

Comment: David Stein - It might be better for these to be separate letters since they issues are pretty distinct from one another.

Comment: Rithy - It looks like a lot of members of the BAC are interested. Defers to PAC.

Josh and Brenda recuse themselves due to conflict of interest and defer to Kenzie,

The PAC letter, if written at this point, would be very high level.

Teresa reminds the group about how specifics of bike and ped elements will be flushed out more once an alignment is chosen.

-- 8:30 Meeting adjourned --