

Bicycle Advisory Committee Meeting
City Hall, Lovejoy Room
6-8:00pm | January 14th, 2020

BAC Members Present: Alexandra Zimmerman, David Stein, Christopher Achterman, Clint Culpepper, Reza Farhoodi, Catherine Gould, Iain MacKenzie, Phil Richman

BAC Members Absent: Sarah Iannarone, Alexa Jakusovsky, Rithy Khut

PBOT Staff Present: Roger Geller, Owen Slyman

Other Attendees: Jonathan Maus, John Russell, Terry Dublinski-Milton, Emmy Fa, Brenda Martin, Paul Buchanan, Brayden Donnelly, Chris Holland

Guest Presenters: Francesca Patricolo (PBOT), Timur Ender (PBOT)

I. Announcements

The Safer Outer Stark online open house concluded on January 15th.

An open house for PBOT's SW Capitol Highway project will be held on January 30th at the Multnomah Arts Center.

A BAC member mentioned they would like to see more effort put into work zone plans.

Another member noted that the February BAC meeting will be the 10-year anniversary of the 2030 Bike Plan's passage by City Council.

II. Net Meter Revenue Policy Review

Francesca Patricolo from PBOT presented to the BAC on Portland's meter revenue policy, for which there will be an open house on January 28th in the Portland Building. Patricolo explained that the policy was passed by City Council in 1996 so that new parking districts could receive revenue from the meters within them. Patricolo added that meters are typically a last resort to manage parking, usually after time limits, for example.

For the policy review, Patricolo said PBOT assembled a variety of stakeholders to better understand how to improve meter district policy and interest other districts in managing their parking. In areas that collect meter revenue, this revenue can go toward bike projects, for example. Roger Geller mentioned that meter revenue is the second largest discretionary funding source in Portland, meaning there are no federal guidelines dictating how it can be spent.

A BAC member asked how much a parking spot is worth monetarily. Patricolo answered that there is an ongoing effort that is dealing with pricing curb space, which should provide some answers. She added that the City does not manage parking for revenue generation but rather as a method of managing its transportation system.

Another member asked how districts provide input to where meter revenues are spent. Patricolo responded that some districts have set their own principles around how meter revenue ought to be spent, adding that PBOT is proposing a plan that would ask future districts to identify their guidelines, goals, and desired improvements. This could include benches and lighting, among other things that make the community feel an identity and sense of place and safety. Those plans will guide improvements in a district.

A member asked which specific policy changes were being made, and how they may influence which parking becomes metered and how new districts are created. Patricolo answered that the process would involve areas developing a parking management plan and determining a community need for parking meters, along with other options like residential parking permits.

III. Central City in Motion: SE Hawthorne-Madison, NW/SW Broadway, MLK and Grand

Timur Ender from PBOT presented to the BAC on the proposed Central City in Motion projects. As an aside, Ender first mentioned that per the BAC's comments from last year, SE 136th Ave. will have concrete protected bike lanes installed in Summer 2020.

As for Central City in Motion, Ender mentioned that the project looks to make the most of the existing right of way, including improvements like pedestrian crossings, low-stress bikeways, and enhanced transit corridors.

Along NW Broadway, Ender said PBOT would be installing protected bike lanes with white delineator posts from NW Irving to SW Oak. The west side of the street would be pro-time parking, and the existing right turn at NW Hoyt would be prohibited due to the high number and speed of bicyclists riding south from the Broadway Bridge.

Ender mentioned that there would be two upcoming Central City in Motion open houses: February 18th from 4-6 pm at the White Stag Building and February 27th from 5-7 pm in the Revolution Hall Astoria Room.

A BAC member asked what happened to SW 4th Ave, believing it had been slated as a potential quick build project last summer. Ender answered that project design started in late 2019 and involves intensive civil infrastructure. As such, it is a massive project on the scale of SW Naito, but it is fully funded. Ender noted that Metro's T2020 Transportation Bond is proposed to fully fund Central City in Motion, and PBOT cannot start design on other projects until the results of that ballot measure are announced in November. PBOT is putting together funding sources through Systems Development Charges and Fixing Our Streets funding, among others.

Another BAC member commented that they were generally concerned that drivers are not skilled at avoiding wands and paint, and that these methods of protection may not be sufficient.

A member asked why the whole stretch of Broadway, south of SW Oak St, was not being worked on. Ender responded that the adjacent land uses dramatically change south of SW Oak St, as loading zones and other uses become more prevalent. In addition, PBOT is looking to limit the project cost to less than \$200,000, as that is the limit beyond which city work forces cannot perform the work. Contracting out the work would dramatically increase the costs, well beyond what is available to the project budget.

A member commented that if the City is doing a quick build, it should just finish the quick build.

A member asked if the City is worried about what the Portland Business Alliance thinks about the plan. Ender answered that PBOT is more concerned with design specific to adjacent land uses. If project costs exceed \$200,000, Ender added, PBOT cannot do much else. He mentioned that PBOT is trying to do something soon with resources it has. A member inquired whether this was a barrier to Central City in Motion construction, asking how close PBOT is to the \$200,000 mark. Ender answered that current costs are very close to \$200,000.

Ender mentioned that he expects this project to increase ridership as it connects bike facilities to other bike facilities, adding that he understands that it may not be what the BAC hopes for in terms of protection. An attendee responded that they do not necessarily expect it to

increase ridership, mentioning that quality of connections, rather than just more connections, is essential for increasing ridership. They do not expect to see new riders.

Ender asked the BAC what they believe to be the best path forward at the moment. A member answered that they would prefer infrastructure on the ground and would rather move forward with a design below their preferred standards that PBOT will commit to upgrading later.

A member asked if there were any examples in Portland where PBOT replaced delineator posts with more substantial protection. Ender answered that besides Rosa Parks and Naito, there is not a long history of protected facilities in Portland.

Another member asked what other protection options exist at the current price point, mentioning they do not feel safe with wands in place. Roger Geller answered that on N Greeley Ave, PBOT is placing concrete jersey barriers. A member mentioned that planters are a cheap option for protection as well. Ender said that this BAC feedback is helpful, and that there is a tension between quick and cheap projects, or slow projects with quality materials.

A BAC member responded that they would be more comfortable with just paint and posts if the project spanned an entire corridor, not just eight blocks.

Another member mentioned that planter boxes visually create more of an impediment to cars than paint and wands.

A member asked if speeds of adjacent cars are accounted for when painted bike lanes are put in, and if so, if PBOT has analyzed how car speeds change with the addition of protected bike lanes. Roger Geller answered that speeds are typically looked at, and they tend to lower slightly as travel lanes narrow. That was based on research done many years ago when PBOT first began striping bicycle lanes.

The BAC then turned to discuss the project on Hawthorne. A member mentioned they had problems with the up-and-over bus design; Ender responded that PBOT is looking to remove some, if not all, parking to accommodate a ten-foot modular transit platform similar to the Hawthorne Bridge going westbound.

A member mentioned they would like to hear whether PBOT resolved the problem that cancelled modular transit platforms at Rosa Parks and 18th-19th, adding that when the bus lane

went in, the same design was proposed, but they heard concerns about the difference between curb height and module height, meaning that it did not meet ADA standards.

Another member mentioned that they want parking to go, adding that they wish for the County to give up street parking as they have a parking garage across the street.

A member asked about the average speed of eastbound bikes. Roger Geller answered that speeds are comparable to SW Madison between SW 3rd & 4th, probably 18-19 miles per hour. Another member asked if PBOT had seen any studies on passing that may justify bike lane widths, adding that they were concerned about right hooks when bikes are travelling at 18-19 miles per hour.

A member mentioned that the designs were not matching low-cost visualizations and hopes there is a backup plan should Metro's T2020 transportation bond not pass.

Another member commented that protection that keeps bikes out of car lanes may make some left turns hard as bikes can no longer use those lanes. Ender responded that the plan he is working to implement was approved by City Council, so PBOT cannot make too many changes. A member responded that at the very least, the project should adhere to the PedPDX toolkit.

Ender noted that TriMet Line 10 will be taken away once the Division Transit Project is implemented, at which point there will be an opportunity for diversion. He added that feedback from traffic engineers' states that fewer right turns at multiple locations is preferable to more right turns at one spot.

A member asked if there was any data from observations on SW 2nd, mentioning that cars frequently turn in front of them at that intersection. Ender answered that his personal observations are that people do not look, and that the project is more about the side of the street rather than the distance between bikes and cars. Another member added that drivers may not be looking either way.

A member mentioned that they like the consolidated bus and streetcar stop along MLK and Grand, noting that it is a better-quality waiting environment.

Another member mentioned that along Rose Lane projects, red paint should be the full length of the lane. Ender responded that PBOT must apply to the Federal Highway Administration

every time it wants to use red paint, which is a slow approach. The existing request to experiment allows for red paint at the top of the block only, and red paint can be very expensive.

The BAC mentioned they would like a memo on how Central City in Motion is addressing the committee's comments and how or why they were or were not met. A member added that they would like to see an update on the Central City in Motion implementation strategy at some point.

IV. Committee Business

A member mentioned that they do not see the path forward for protected bike lanes and improved transit along the major roadways that intersect with the Transportation System Plan (TSP) and the 2030 Bike Plan. They did not see the bike classifications in the TSP being referenced when it comes to bikeways and would like a list of all intersections that are proposed to have protected bike lanes. The member mentioned maybe allowing bikes in bus lanes along major roadways without bike facilities until those facilities are developed. Roger Geller responded that he would be cautious about bus-only lanes being used for bikes as it has not worked well for other jurisdictions that have tried that approach.

A representative from TriMet asked the BAC whether an 11-foot bus-only lane next to the bike lane provides enough protection. Committee members responded that it depends on the width of the bike lane, and that different corridors behave differently. Geller provided an example on the Burnside Bridge, where people ride on the other side of delineator posts to pass. A BAC member added that bicyclists may have to worry about not being noticed by bus operators.

The BAC unanimously moved to approve a letter calling out specific corridors in need of bicycle improvements.

The BAC then discussed a potential letter of support for the Fixing Our Streets 2 measure. A member commented that Fixing Our Streets are not helping bicycle improvements. Another member noted that bike improvements may not be as straightforward as PBOT expects the measure to pass by a slim margin. Geller mentioned that there is neighborhood greenway funding on the list, as well as Northwest in Motion funding.

A member asked about potential improvements on Hawthorne, Alberta, and Fremont. Geller mentioned that those streets are not as easy to tackle, while other streets are low-hanging fruit that will be more conducive to easy improvement. He added that there are greater

opportunities on the proposed Fixing Our Streets projects; \$4 million of Fixing Our Streets 2 funding is intended to enhance other projects on the list.

A BAC member noted that some projects on the list are not possible within allotted budget, and there is no backup funding if those projects are agreed upon by committee. BAC members commented that they want to push the measure to be more bike-friendly; one member added that the measure is good for bikes, but it is one of the few funding sources with lots of flexibility and it does not go far enough for bike improvements.

A member added that they would want a committee letter to express that specific bike improvements are needed for the BAC's enthusiastic support.

Another member mentioned that they would like the committee to send a separate letter about what PBOT has promised but not delivered.

The BAC moved to make the proposed changes to their Fixing Our Streets 2 letter; the motion passed, with one nay vote.

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, by telephone (503) 823-2559, by City TTY 503-823-6868, or use Oregon Relay Service: 711.