

**Bicycle Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**City Hall, Lovejoy Room**  
**6-8:00pm | December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2019**

**BAC Members Present:** Alexandra Zimmerman, David Stein, Christopher Achterman, Clint Culpepper, Reza Farhoodi, Sarah Iannarone, Rithy Khut, Iain MacKenzie

**BAC Members Absent:** Catherine Gould, Alexa Jakusovsky, Phil Richman

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

**Other Attendees:** Marvin Rambo, Justin Holmes

**Guest Presenters:** Mark Lear (PBOT), April Bertelsen (PBOT)

---

**I. Announcements**

A BAC member mentioned that the committee should draft a letter regarding the Lloyd to Woodlawn project as soon as preliminary drawings are released.

Another member discussed the new Burnside Bridge road configuration, mentioning that the bike lane width is not sufficient for passing. The member added that the right turn lane at the west end of the bridge is mostly unused and could use better signage or possibly be eliminated.

Roger Geller discussed the clauses in the committee bylaws that the BAC had previously asked about. Paragraphs relating to conduct of meetings are not in the current version of the bylaws, while the clauses relating to the BAC's interactions with the Office of Government Relations will be included in the bylaws.

Geller also mentioned that recruitment for new BAC members is now live online at [www.PortlandOregon.gov/Civic/Apply](http://www.PortlandOregon.gov/Civic/Apply).

Geller mentioned that the BAC's feedback on the Flanders bikeway was well-received by people at the greenway's council testimony. He added that the bike parking update and Southwest in Motion were both adopted by City Council the week before the December BAC meeting.

## II. Fixing Our Streets 2 Redux

Mark Lear from PBOT returned to the BAC to present an update on Fixing Our Streets 2 and discuss issues the BAC previously identified. Lear mentioned that the polling data looks close again, and that the proposal still employs a basic maintenance/basic safety breakdown without pitting them against each other. Lear added that Fixing Our Streets 2 is not meant to be the sole way to fund transportation improvements; the measure is designed to work in conjunction with other measures and efforts.

Lear described the proposed new allocation as a three-part split between street services, smoother streets, and safer streets. These include paving overlays, crossing improvements, sidewalks and walkways, Safe Routes to School projects, high crash corridor street lighting, bikeway network development, and small-scale neighborhood safety. Lear added that FOS2 is also aggressively aiming to reduce speeds, as Vision Zero goals are not being met.

A BAC member asked how these elements intersect with other safety-type enhancements, and how much repaving is planned vs. striping, buffering, and other similar enhancements. Lear answered that a few potential projects are seeking funding from other sources as well; more of the enhancement bucket is in the paving side, but restriping, buffering, etc. will be part of this bucket as well.

Another BAC member asked how much PBOT was coordinating with BES; Lear said he would follow up on that.

Another member asked whether the FOS2 lighting goals are pedestrian-scale or larger. Lear answered that it is still being determined, but the PedPDX Walking While Black study informed a lot of the lighting guidelines.

A member expressed concern that Fixing Our Streets 2 will reach  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the way through the 2035 Bike Plan, but the most serious things that need to happen will not. Another member proposed using more community input to directly decide where to allocate funds in their area.

Another BAC member asked whether FOS2 could include the Missing Links program run by PBOT, suggesting that some FOS funding be allocated to the program.

Lear mentioned that FOS2 is not pushing diversion as a strategy; a BAC member responded that not leading with diversion will hurt the city.

Another member mentioned that TNCs and large fleets probably bulk-buy their fuel outside of Portland and asked if there was discussion on how to close loopholes avoiding Portland gas taxes. Lear answered that PBOT is working on solutions to that, and that the claim that people would always go outside Portland to buy gas has not held true as much as they initially thought.

A member added that a number of personal vehicles are used for deliveries, which may be harder to track. Lear responded that regardless of purpose of trip, they are being charged for buying gas, and that Noah Siegel, PBOT Deputy Director, is working on regulating vehicle uses.

Another member worried that too much of the effort could be maintaining the status quo; Lear responded that the question from a political standpoint is trying to find funding without having demonstrated community support.

A member expressed that PBOT's job should be to implement over communicating and building support. They added that planners should not need to sit at neighborhood meetings as much and should employ other groups and means to build community support, especially regarding diverters, for example.

Another member said that at the very least, projects should start from the master plan, adding that most plans seem to have been passed at political cost. They did not want to see the plans watered down.

Lear responded that while it may not seem incremental to the BAC, the level of investment here is incredibly high from his perspective. A member asked whether there was any budget capacity to pass the measure; Lear answered that there is no budget capacity to run the campaign, and under state law, every communication will have to be approved after a ballot title is assigned. The member added that they encourage things like participatory budgeting and addressing real worries to garner grassroots support.

The BAC agreed to draft a letter of support for City Council before January 22<sup>nd</sup>.

### **III. Rose Lane Project**

April Bertelsen, PBOT Transit Coordinator, presented to the BAC on the Rose Lane project. The online survey was open until December 16<sup>th</sup>, garnering over 1000 responses at the time of the committee meeting. The project aims to develop a bundle of Rose Lane pilot projects with transit

priority, identify a vision for a broader enhanced transit priority network, create a unique Rose Lane visual identity, and work in partnership with TriMet to create a network of transit routes that are faster, frequent, and full. Bertelsen added that the overarching goals are increasing equity, resiliency, safety, and transit ridership, reducing racial disparities, and combating climate change. She mentioned that many buses and streetcars are stuck in traffic, delayed, and late, shrinking access to jobs, school, and more, adding that Portland needs to more than double transit ridership to meet its mode split goals.

Bertelsen mentioned that the project is in development phase right now and will be going before Council on February 13, 2020. PBOT is picking candidates by identifying where delay is worst, where ridership is at least 1500 people, and where there are at least 4 buses per hour during peak travel time.

Bertelsen added that current efforts include evaluating potential benefits and trade-offs, including impacts on pedestrian and bike infrastructure, safety, traffic, and parking removal and looking to Boston and Minneapolis for examples.

A BAC member asked whether PBOT would be going before Council for the entire proposal at once. Bertelsen responded that she would be presenting the proposed pilots to Council, and it mostly depends on which direction Council wants to go.

Another member asked how long it takes to receive FHWA permission for red paint. Bertelsen answered that the application that was approved in September 2019 allowed for red paint experimentation in several locations; that application must be amended in order to request approval for additional locations. PBOT is collecting data on effectiveness of that red paint.

A member asked whether PBOT was looking at proposed impacts with equal weight, or whether certain criteria were valued more highly. They asked why parking removal was listed as an impact for consideration on the project presentation. Bertelsen responded that this category is not just strictly for parking, but also loading zones, delivery, and more. The inclusion of this criterion doesn't mean PBOT might not go forward with Rose Lanes, but that she wants to make sure that the tradeoffs are understood. Removing travel lanes will likely be a way PBOT achieves its Rose Lane goals.

Another member mentioned that buses going quickly still need to stop as they get ahead of schedule, asking what considerations PBOT and TriMet have for helping buses get back on schedule as buses waiting for a long time can be disruptive and unsafe for bikes. Bertelsen

answered that there is a high degree of variability in travel time today, and so buses must allow for more time to accommodate. The Rose Lane project hopes to reduce that variability and tighten up bus schedules.

A BAC member asked whether there was thought of increasing the amount of bike parking along longer transit corridors with the expectation that transit ridership would increase. The member asked about any design changes along Williams, Vancouver, and Sandy. Bertelsen answered that along N Williams, for one, PBOT just made a significant investment in improving bike facilities, and it is unlikely it will be dramatically changed. Along Sandy, Bertelsen noted that there are many curb extensions, which PBOT is beginning to look at more in-depth.

Another member asked whether there was any potential for buses to alter signals. Bertelsen answered that PBOT is interested in that technology, but there is an antiquated transit priority signal system in some places today. The region is looking to move toward a new system altogether that would be smarter and more dynamic.

A BAC member commented that they would prefer PBOT take a bold approach to the Rose Lane pilot locations, and that the City should be fine with these locations being experimental.

*Meeting Adjourned.*

*To help ensure equal access to City programs, services and activities, the City of Portland will provide translation, reasonably modify policies/procedures, and provide auxiliary aids/services/alternative formats to persons with disabilities. For accommodations, translations, complaints, and additional information, contact the Civil Rights Title VI & ADA Title II Program by email at [title6complaints@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:title6complaints@portlandoregon.gov), by telephone (503) 823-2559, by City TTY 503-823-6868, or use Oregon Relay Service: 711.*