



1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Dan Saltzman Commissioner **Leah Treat** Director

PedPDX: Portland's Citywide Pedestrian Plan
Community Advisory Committee

Meeting Agenda

Tue. April 25th, 2018 5:30-7:30 PM

Portland Central Library | US Bank Meeting Room
801 SW 10th Ave, Portland, OR - 97205

Committee Members in Attendance: Beth Omansky, David Bouchard, Debra Monzon, Eric Koszyk, Eugenia Andreev, Evelyn Ferreira, Gudeta Wak-Woya, Janet Hawkins, Lucy Brehm, Matthew Cramer, Traci Chenette.

1. Welcome / Housekeeping

Upcoming meetings May 30th and June 27th – No meetings in July/August

- Question - One member inquired about the September meeting date.
- Response – Meetings are held on the 3rd Wednesday, it's online.

PedPDX Stories – thank you to University of Oregon the producing the PedPDX Ped Stories videos. Francesca shares that PBOT wanted to do a mini-thank you and give out gifts. Thanks individuals profiled in the videos.

Announcements from the PedPDX CAC: Neighborhood Walks this summer including a “Walkway” collaboration with Rosewood and AARP (Oregon Walks).



The Portland Bureau of Transportation fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the ADA Title II, and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. For accommodations, complaints and information, call (503) 823-5185, City TTY (503) 823-6868, or use Oregon Relay Service: 711.

2. Project Timeline

Michelle: Preface, lots of dense material, going to be moving quickly. Thanks to everyone who gave feedback on final goals and vision (reviews goals and vision).

3. Pedestrian Priority Network.

Michelle contextualizes where we are in the process – gives overview of the evening's topics.

Key Questions for this meeting: What might we need to modify about our approach to make sure we identify the right set of prioritized needs?

Michelle connects the plan to Comp Plan goals (centers and corridors) for capturing growth. Aligns priority investments of the PedPDX plan to this overarching growth strategy.

- Q: Does that mean it's based on zoning?
- Michelle: Yes, this concept of centers and corridors allows is supported by zoning that maximizes activity (through mixed use zoning and more dense development).

Michelle walks through each classification designation:

- 1) Pedestrian districts would be an overlay where you would have more stringent design standards (crosswalks, sidewalks, etc.). These are the highest demand pedestrian areas.
- 2) Major City Walkways – designed to capture transit and pedestrian demand. Because of the intended growth and land use designations most of the growth and resultant pedestrian activity would occur here. Includes the frequent transit corridors (based on expected demand). Major city walkways also include the core downtown streets (high demand streets and activity).
- 3) City Walkways – all other arterials and collectors and all transit routes (lower demand than City Walkways). Ties into feedback from survey.
- 4) Neighborhood Walkways – There are some key neighborhood streets that serve key destinations and connections. We wanted to identify these so we could prioritize

investments. 1) all local streets within ped districts; 2) local streets within a ½ mile of fixed rail stops; 3) Designated SRTS network; 4) Existing neighborhood greenways; 5) pedestrian paths that lie in the ROW (stairs, paths, key connections that don't necessarily carry vehicles.).

- 5) Trails – Regional trails and recreational routes (through parks and along the waterfront).

Key takeaway – “Pedestrian Network captures demand”.

Francesca – clarifies, says “this is our pedestrian network, not this is where all the money is planned to go”.

Michelle – “This is one step, and we’ll present our prioritization framework to decide how money is applied to this network. In order to get money for improvements, you would need to be on this pedestrian network”.

- Q: You talked about demand, but where do equity and safety come in?
- Michelle: That would show in prioritization, we have a proposed idea for how we would prioritize equity and safety.
- Q: Is there a possibility that there is an intersection where people have died but isn't on the map?
- M: We have an idea about how can be addressed through our prioritization framework.
- Q: Is it possible that equity would not be captured on this map?
- M: Yes, but this network is framed around demand. If you were in a high equity area, but did not have high demand, you would not rise to the top.
- Q: In determining the ped classification was vehicle volume considered or just ped need?
- M: Just pedestrian need. The only role that vehicle volume played at all was that we wanted to make sure we were including arterial and collectors.
- Q: How did you measure demand?
- M: Land use designations primarily.
- Q: Because you are projecting those are the areas that will be developed, that's where you're investing?
- M: Yes, we want to match land use and transportation investments.

- Q: Did these maps consider multi-family and single-family zoning? Was that considered in this map at all? Was the rezoning taken into classification?
- M: Zoning follows comp plan designations. We are looking ahead of zoning. This is the plan that will help guide investments citywide, including the planning bureau.
- Q: When you look at Demand, Equity, Safety – for example, outer Stark or Sandy, etc. – Do you believe there could be pressed demand because of the safety? The demand might not be apparent. The demand could be tied to the safety of the street – people forced to find other ways to get around besides walking? How does this account for that?
- Michelle: I agree that unsafe conditions are likely to curb behavior. We wanted to make sure we were collecting all of the arterial and collector streets – regardless of the demand currently there. All of the streets you mentioned are going to get picked up. To the extent they have safety issues and equity concerns, they will also be prioritized. Admittedly, this is going to be an iterative process, we want to show you what we’re thinking, get your feedback, try it out, and get your feedback to make sure we’re not missing anything.

4. Draft Needs Analysis (Presentation by Alta)

Spacing 530 feet between marked crosswalks in ped districts; outside of ped districts – 800 feet. Over 3,500 marked crosswalks are needed! That’s why we have to prioritize

Crossing spacing is better in Central City, major gaps east of the river. Some major gaps might not get prioritized (gives the example of NW Skyline through Forest Park).

Explains crosswalk typology matrix based on lanes, speeds, volume. Gives an example of each level of crossing treatment (marked crosswalk, median refuge, flashing, signal).

Raises the issue of crashes happening at signalized intersections. Francesca adds – “and provide strategies in our toolkit for these situations”.

Key Findings:

- 1) Gaps are more common than deficiencies (many deficient crossings on MLK, Powell/Foster, Sandy)
- 2) Gaps along the Roadway: Looked at walkway guidelines (sidewalk on both sides, or Alternative Pedestrian Walkway (including walkway on one side; shared local street). Michelle adds, “Our proposed pedestrian guidelines stipulated that there would be a

walkway on both sides, unless there was a situation where a sidewalk on one side would be a *complete improvement*" – unless: low-speeds; topographical or environmental; traffic calming present; street meets crossing spacing guidelines. For a shared local street – 1) local; 2) <15mph; 3) <18ft travel space. Advisory walkways, protected should to be considered an interim improvement.

- Q: I would like a better definition of shared streets? Does that mean bikes and peds in the same walkway? With "interim" is there some kind of timeframe for what's considered interim?
- Michelle: (referring to interim) – No, that's a really good question. We haven't given ourselves a timeline on that – the reason is strategic – we wanted to give ourselves the flexibility to provide a walkway even if we don't know when there's going to be money to fund a full improvement.
- Francesca: Gives an example of utilizing repaving opportunities to provide interim improvements.
- M: I'd like to resend all of the materials that we reviewed previously on alternative walkways. Shared local streets definition: On shared local streets that have lower than 500 cars a day, 15mph or lower; and traffic calming – vehicles, bikes, and peds would share the whole street. We have a couple of these (gives example of NW 13th).
- Q: If you're going to have marking that designate where the best places to walk are – it's really useful to explore using tactile markings (truncated domes). There are cases where guide posts have been used to provide some indication where the best place to walk is. I realize that a blind person walking along might not be expecting that, but it's still important to retrofit and make sure it is part of the process (for any sort of striping). If you're going to have a visual, you should have a tactile.
- Q: Shared local streets is something that designated, not a classification.
- M: Yes, it's an intentional design because it requires signage and specific design.
- Q: Defining quality (of a shared street) is no sidewalk?
- M: Defining quality is that all users share the roadway together.

[presentation continues]

Key findings:

(50% Walkway on both sides; 32% Gap on both sides; 10% Gap on one side, doesn't meet criteria for alternative street design; 8% Gap, but meets criteria).

- Michelle: I want to highlight a statistic that was just shared – 32% of collectors and arterials have a gap on both sides.
- Q: I want to point out that is a land use decision (because of multi-family housing) and city policy for a decade.
- M: I would suggest that it is standard of county development standards (East and Southwest Portland).
- Q: This is happening today! PBOT is continuing to allow development like this to happen.

Along the Roadway: Deficiencies (6-foot sidewalk width). Key findings: 20% of street analyzed have a deficient width on one or both sides. Areas within ped districts less likely to be deficient; neighborhood streets more likely to have deficiencies.

5. Draft Prioritization Criteria (Presentation by Alta)

Prioritization criteria is tied to goals (Equity, Safety, Demand). Essentially going to give a prioritization score for each block in the pedestrian network. Our hope is that if we have the formula right, the needs that will emerge will meet the goals of the PedPDX plan.

Scoring for demand based on classification and whether or not the street is in a pedestrian district. Within Ped District (10,7,4); Outside of Ped District (7,4,1) (Major City Walkway, City Walkway, Neighborhood Walkway, respectively)

- Q: How are the scores chosen?
- R: Its based directly on the spectrum of demand that Michelle described. (i.e. Neighborhood walkways are lowest demand, so they get the lowest value).
- Q: But why is it a "1" instead of a "2"?
- R: This is a draft. The goal here is to differentiate; to find what is a priority area, and what is a lesser priority area.

Trails are not included in the prioritization analysis – final decision on this is TBD.

Equity – pull directly from PBOT’s own Equity Matrix – which is based directly on race and income. We’re going to use that to score equity needs throughout the pedestrian network.

- Q: Census tracts are at the aggregate level, it could be done at the census block level. (gives example of low-income areas along BH highway). It like to frame the conversation around block group level, to get more granular data.
- Francesca: There's a thought that the census tract level can be helpful in anticipating growth at a higher level. We know that demographics are changing a lot in Portland, and we might dial in too closely.
- Michelle: I passed this question along to the Equity manager and she had some thoughts to share.
- Q: When you talk about trails are you talking about the Springwater Corridor? I-205 trails?
- R: Yes, all regional trails.
- Q: But that's not included in your current analysis?
- R: Yes, we're thinking of how to incorporate that.
- Q: Each of the three categories, is weighted equally. Shouldn't it be 10?
- R: Clarifies that it's 5 for race and 5 for income.
- Q: Do you know if they've had disability included in this matrix?
- R: That's a really good question. I'll make sure our equity manager addresses it in the memo.

Safety – Sum of High Crash Network (HCN) (4); Streets with 3 or more lanes (2); Street segments with a high density of Killed/Serious Injury (KSI) ped collisions (2); Locations with posted speeds of 30 mph or higher or 85% percentile (2). HCN comes from Vision Zero. Statistics on KSI compared to overall crashes; connection between speed and severity; connection between number of travel lanes and prevalence of crashes.

6. Discussion, Questions, Reflections

Key Question: What do we need to consider about our approach to make sure we're identifying the key needs and priorities?

- Q: Pedestrian HCN and HCN – are those the same thing?
- R: No. PHCN is only for ped crashes, HCN is calculated with all crashes.
- Q: We have a lot of streets in Portland that are only two lanes that have really high volumes and are really dangerous – how can we keep that in consideration?

Asks the PedPDX CAC to go around and give a comment, [which are listed in bullet form below]:

- Thank you for all your work. I'm really concerned about equity and I'm seeing this as a place that falls through the cracks all the time. I'm worried that scoring equity equally with demand doesn't seem right to me. I think that equity really relates to demand. When I see 'people that have to walk' I see equity and demand. I'm concerned that places will fall through the cracks since they won't show up on demand. (gives example of multi-family use of single-family housing). I would like to see more about equity. I'm concerned about equity not being measured at the block level – maybe by working with groups like Africa House we can make sure that we're not missing anything there.
- Really impressive work – I like the emphasis on equity. The only piece that could use more nuance is maybe the safety piece. Maybe volume would be good to look at. 30mph doesn't seem that compelling since we're already looking at arterials.
- Thank you, I like it. I wonder if there's an opportunity to make it really efficient and connect to jobs. I'm not sure if census and land use classifications really capture the issue of where people live and work and need for communicating.
- I do agree that disabilities are captured into the equity piece. I would like to flush out safety concerns (including traffic volumes and speeds).
- I'm going to secondary equity but I think it would be helpful to capture other vulnerable groups as well (including elderly and youth). SRTS and parks – maybe daycare centers and other schools as well (private or charter). I think that would be valuable to include in the safety and equity component. I feel like I'm constantly getting news about crashes happening on neighborhood streets so a way to capture that as well.
- Francesca: Forgot to acknowledge people who were killed on the street network since our last meeting. I apologize and will bring up at the next meeting.
- As a school teacher, I see equity thrown around everywhere. I think getting to the granular level of groups within boundaries. When we talk about enjoyment we might be over capturing our arterials and collectors. The map still looks like a car map to me. It looks like these are all driving routes. When you're walking, you might prefer a neighborhood greenway route.
- Thank you for sharing the process. I was left kind of thirsty to see more about the equity piece. It seemed odd to see equity treated individually, rather than incorporated in all elements of the process. It's not just a checkbox, something that we do, but something that should be considered throughout.
- I would like to echo the equity questions. It just seemed like there was a gap in the way information was presented or potentially collected. Since this is a forward-

looking plan, but how the workforce is shifting and changing. How can we consider that? Knowing that vulnerable populations might be shifting to different parts of the city and the state. I'd like to acknowledge the comments about the car-driven process. I'd like to see if there are ways to get out of that and have it been a pedestrian focused solution.

- I worried a little at the beginning that all the big streets are going to get a lot of stuff. I thought me as a person walking around (I'm not walking down Barbur Blvd). I think that we should be looking at enforcement around speed, some kind of enforcement around that. We should make developers pay their fair share of that so that it doesn't fall entirely on the city.
- I was worried that it was going to be all the main road and East PDX is going to get the short end of the stick.
- My vision of equity is that it should permeate all aspects of how business is done and the general culture. I'd like to discuss the safety of street deterring ped activity. With regard to crossing, if there are going to be crosswalks that are not marked, I just want to make sure that if there are all these standards to be maybe lowered – I would just hate to see that if there are accidents in these areas where there are no crosswalks... We've just really got to avoid that as much as possible
- Of course, I am interested in the equity piece and am surprised there's not a universal definition of equity across all city departments. If we say that we're going to have 6ft wide sidewalks – how is the city going to make sure there's not utility poles that take up half the sidewalk. How is the issues of sidewalk seating and sandwich boards and other clutter going to be addressed?
- I would like trails added to Ped Priority network. Getting people off sidewalks and onto trails (away from cars) has got to be a priority. Getting people even further away from cars has got to be a priority. Also, parks, should be studied more.
- I want to value the information that we can get from community-based groups to really get at the questions around how we're representing these groups in our equity analysis. I want to put a plug for the NA's to share information. Neighborhood groups can tell you about their neighborhood. (request about getting information ahead of the meeting, one week to give more feedback).

6) Public Comment

- I think the two most significant things you can do to improve safety is to reduce the speed. The second is related to crossings. Oregon's law is the most supportive of crossings – why is that not being enforced. Try following the crosswalk law for one month and see what happens.
- I love these pedestrian zones, I would love to orient towards pedestrianizing where possible. There's other streets that could be pedestrianized at some point.
- A lot of the criteria for prioritization are corridor based (arterial and corridors). The thought of adding designations along those corridors, medical centers for older people, schools.
- I think that the scoring will have to be revisited but you got to start somewhere. The mission statement is beautiful. The fact that you renamed arterials as major city walkways, that is really radical. We should be consistent with our language (instead of crossing roadways, we should be talking about streets). East Portland relies on City Walkways to move throughout the neighborhood.
- Are speed cameras considered a traffic calming tool?
 - Michelle: they are an enforcement tool, not a traffic calming tool.
- The alternative designs are not being vetted between meetings. The analysis that we've been looking at tonight are based on the old network. I hope you re-do the analysis. The maps are really hard to read. You need to clarify the difference between a pedestrian walkway and a sidewalk. Gives example of issues where pedestrians and bicyclists conflict in multi-use path and how that would be addressed in design. For alternative designs, you need to clarify whether your definition of accessibility really meets the ADA standards.
- I really like the enforcement idea – for a public safety campaign to remind people that they should be stopping when they're supposed to stop. I was just wondering if there are other methodologies that other cities are doing and what they are doing.
 - Francesca: I'd like to say that we're trailblazers with a lot of the policy that we're drafting (gives example of crossing spacing).
- We should know the density of vehicle ownership and value of vehicles. For instance, look at LID for improvements in wealthy areas. I want to encourage that we move this information to include more vulnerable groups and people with disabilities.