


City of Portland  
**Pedestrian Advisory Committee**

  
August 18th, 2020  
6:00 - 8:30 AM

Committee Members:	Alternate Members:
Brian Landoe Patricia Jewitt Evelyn Ferreira* Matthew Hall+ Kenzie Woods* Josh Channell Tiel Jackson* Josh Roll Ashley Schofield Kevin Glenn* Zoe Klingmann* Matthew Cramer Hanna Osman* Mark Raggett* Rebecca Sanders* Autumn Schaefer*	

\* Indicates committee members in attendance // + Indicates committee member excused

Staff Present: Michelle Marx, Owen Slyman

Special Guests and Speakers:

**6:00-6:05: How to use Zoom for Public Meetings (5 min)**

**6:05-6:30: Hot Topics/Updates and Announcements/Committee Business (25 min)**

Michelle Marx provided the monthly Vision Zero update:

- On July 19, Joann Mardis, was severely injured while driving after she was struck by two vehicles at NE Russell St at NE 122nd Ave. She died on July 27.
- On July 22, Julie Dunlap, age 45, died while riding in a vehicle that crashed at SE 122nd Ave and SE 122nd Ave.
- On July 29, Sarah Bulbuk, age 1, died after being struck in the roadway of the 17200 block of SE Mill Ct.

There is an open seat for a PAC representative on the city Bureau and Budget Advisory Committee (BBAC) as the previous representative stepped down due to time conflicts. The BBAC advises PBOT on budget priorities, and members feel it is important to have a PAC representative in that conversation.

A member mentioned it is important to continue the conversation on whether the traffic education items presented by the Portland Police Bureau in the previous month's meeting prioritize safety, well-being, and equity, and if they are actually effective safety education. They mentioned they are considering writing a PAC letter addressed to City Council and PPB. Another member added that all references to PPB were removed from the draft of the white cane safety letter, but there is also a good general discussion to be had on relationship between education and enforcement.

Another member commented that they would prefer to have greater clarity on the PAC's stance before voting on a letter. A member clarified that their impression from last meeting was that PBOT including PPB may not be conducive to educational efforts. Marx mentioned that PBOT is hearing Commissioner Eudaly and agrees that it wants to move away from enforcement-driven education.

A member mentioned that community groups like NAYA and IRCO could be better resources for education. Marx added that the frustration Dana Dickman, PBOT Safety Section Manager, has expressed is that sometimes, budget decisionmakers do not place as great a priority on outreach and education. Another member commented that they want to identify specific things to advocate for, adding that educational efforts are typically most effective when paired with engineering efforts. They asked if there are specific programs PBOT is looking to augment or highlight; Marx responded that she does not know that PBOT has identified programmatic interventions yet.

Another member asked if PBOT had been spending money on enforcement that might now be freed up. Wendy Cawley, City Traffic Engineer, responded that PBOT has not been spending money on enforcement but has been coordinating and partnering with PPB for enforcement. Marx added that one suggestion is to brief the PAC as the PBOT safety committee progresses with work and identifies specific

strategies and actions to move forward with.

Marx mentioned that the item Dickman is struggling with is how much of the budget should be allocated toward capital work vs. education and enforcement. A member asked who influences the decisionmakers; Marx answered that letters from committees like the PAC are taken very seriously by the PBOT director and commissioner.

A member said they would like the focus of the letter to be on the enforcement piece and how it may not be effective in reaching the public as well as posing a public safety issue for many Portlanders. Another member commented that one way to phrase the letter might be stating that the PAC understands and supports PBOT rethinking enforcement and looking into otherwise effective educational and engineering methods. Another member added the letter should push for more clarity about what PBOT is picturing going forward. A few members mentioned they would begin a draft.

A member mentioned that there was interest in the PAC about the renewed effort to replace the I-5 bridge, which is in preplanning stages right now. This is a good opportunity for PAC members to get involved in the project, as there is a strong emphasis on public outreach.

**6:30-6:50: PBOT in East Portland (20 min)**

*Kate Drennan, PBOT*

Kate Drennan provided the PAC with a broad overview of things happening in east Portland. Drennan mentioned that since 2012, approximately \$300M has been spent on various projects in the East Portland in Motion plan. She cited the 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue plan as an example, which is a safety-focused planning effort on a high-crash corridor that aims to improve safety and access for people biking and walking. Drennan also briefly discussed the East Portland Arterial Streets Strategy, Rose Lanes, of which new pilot projects are being planned, and Safer Outer Stark, which has a final report releasing soon.

Drennan shared updates on other capital projects. SE 136<sup>th</sup> Avenue paving and sidewalk installation will begin in 2020, as will the East Portland Access to Employment and Education project, which will complete the 100s Greenway from Powell to Halsey-Weidler. Also in the works is the Outer Division Multimodal Safety Project. Drennan mentioned that a good place to find information on these, and other, East Portland projects is on the new [Portland.gov](http://Portland.gov) website.

Drennan added that through the LTIC program, which funds programming through development fees, PBOT selected three areas to focus on: Cully, Division-Midway, and a section of Southeast Portland. In east Portland, she clarified that the work is specifically focused on residential areas with miles of unimproved side streets, providing gravel grading and adding sidewalks.

Drennan also discussed the Portland in the Streets program, which usually plans block parties and community events but has pivoted to COVID relief efforts like food delivery.

She also presented on Vision Zero efforts, particularly safety training with east Portland community organizations, left turn calming efforts, and speed limit reductions. She added that detailed project and plan information is available at [Portland.gov](http://Portland.gov).

**6:50-7:35: Transportation Modeling “101” (45 min)**

*Wendy Cawley, City Traffic Engineer*

Wendy Cawley presented to the PAC on how PBOT uses modeling for transportation projects. She explained that modeling is being used to see which arterials may see lane reductions and which cannot; all 4- and 5-lane arterials were scanned to see where more complete street designs could be achieved, including wider sidewalks, better pedestrian crossings, and bicycle facilities. She added that converting four-lane streets to three-lane streets, a Vision Zero goal, has strong crash reduction benefits.

Cawley explained that modeling for automobiles is a result of the diversion that happens when lane reduction occurs. Some of the related tradeoffs include fewer gaps in traffic for people walking and biking to cross, fewer gaps for automobiles to turn to or from the street, and longer wait times at signals for pedestrians. Cawley explained that model outputs are used to measure traffic delay, understand diversion, determine the level of outreach needed, and determine mitigation measures.

Cawley presented a technical analysis flow chart for transportation modeling. The flowchart first looks at whether a roadway project is consistent with present and future goals, policies, and projects. Then, PBOT looks at daily traffic volumes (though Cawley noted this metric will be changing to peak hour volume) to identify whether it meets the city traffic level of service standard (currently D). Then the public engagement process occurs. If daily average volumes exceed 10,000 vehicles, then PBOT conducts operational traffic analysis to identify problem points and address signal timing.

A member asked how COVID is affecting traffic analysis. Cawley answered that PBOT has been tracking traffic counts at approximately 30 locations using a variety of methods since the stay at home order was issued: regular traffic counters, hose counts, other static counters. She added that immediately after the stay at home order, traffic volumes were down approximately 50% but have been rising slowly since.

A member mentioned that during a previous presentation, traffic modeling was looking 30 years into the future with projected population growth and cars on the road. They asked whether that projection reflects a mode split representative of the City of Portland’s goals or the current mode split, adding that building with the current split will preserve it. Cawley responded that PBOT uses Metro’s mode, which is calibrated for what is happening in the City of Portland. She added that the model is not necessarily calibrated to specific goals but rather the development the city expects to see, which does account for some mode split shifts. Cawley noted that the City looks at existing conditions first and wants to look at excess capacity. Models are often used to identify the level of pedestrian crossing needed.

A member asked how prescriptive the process is. Cawley responded that ODOT has a different viewpoint than PBOT, valuing level of service and freight interest more highly, for example. The flowchart was developed to illuminate where low-hanging-fruit improvements could be made and to analyze all roadways the same way.

A member asked if it would be possible to get information on pedestrian behavior similar to available traffic data. Cawley responded that PBOT is figuring out level of service standards for pedestrians and bicyclists, which are a little fuzzier. She added that when the City re-does its level of service standards, she wants to look at multimodal standards, for which there are no great current examples.

Another member asked what proportion of four-lane streets fall under the threshold of 10,000 cars per day. Cawley answered that she is not sure if any do. The member asked if there were notable differences in average daily traffic and peak hour traffic among streets; Cawley said that some streets are more prone to high peak volumes than others.

**7:35-7:40: Break** (5 min)

**7:40-8:25: East Portland Arterial Streets Strategy** (45 min)

*Kate Drennan & Steve Szigethy, PBOT*

Kate Drennan and Steve Szigethy presented on the East Portland Arterial Streets Strategy (EPASS), which develops and substantiates design concepts for all PBOT-maintained streets with 4 or more lanes east of 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave. Drennan explained that the concepts are based on best practices, travel modeling, and public engagement, with the core goals of safety, moving people and goods, and asset management through equity and climate justice lenses. She noted that EPASS does not include ODOT facilities.

Szigethy mentioned that the streets included in EPASS are not subject to Level of Service standards in a regulatory fashion, but the metric is looked at. He explained that safety is the leading factor, but the project needs to understand street design changes that affect peak hour Level of Service, travel time increases, and diversion. He noted that design firm HDR recommended PBOT use the software Aimsun Next for traffic modeling.

Szigethy also said that PBOT started to add and build additional scenarios, looking at many options on 122<sup>nd</sup>, for example, and developed maps to look at changes in volumes along corridors. He noted that based on modeling, the project team did not feel comfortable with a road reorganization on Stark, but overall found good potential with minimal to moderate traffic impacts on road reorganizations already in the works. Committed projects include Glisan, 148<sup>th</sup>, 162<sup>nd</sup>, with additional reorganizations on NE Halsey & 92<sup>nd</sup>-100<sup>th</sup>, NE Glisan & 82<sup>nd</sup>-I-205, SE Stark/Washington & 92<sup>nd</sup>-106<sup>th</sup>, and SE 122<sup>nd</sup> & Foster-Holgate.

Szigethy mentioned that PBOT has found mode shift to be fairly inelastic in east Portland compared to other parts of Portland, meaning worsening traffic conditions do not cause as much mode shift as compared to downtown and closer-in Portland. He explained that destinations are largely too far apart and not easily accessible by non-auto modes of travel. COVID-19 traffic counts corroborate this trend. During April, he noted 50 to 60 percent reductions in traffic in inner neighborhoods and downtown, compared to the 20 to 30 percent reductions in east Portland.

Szigethy added that in past modeling efforts, Foster Road shows strain from proposed growth in Pleasant Valley. In general, the aforementioned corridors accommodate mixed-use and dense growth consistent with the comprehensive plan. He noted that in the preferred reorganization scenario, 13.6 miles of 5-lane roads, or 33% of EPASS network, are eliminated. On streets not being reorganized, PBOT is still proposing additional safety tools like center medians, more frequent signalized ped crossings, wider sidewalks, protected bike lanes, lighting, and automated speed enforcement.

The next steps for the project include releasing a video on the subject of Safe Four-Lane Boulevards, as well as releasing the final EPASS report in November 2020.

A member asked if it would be possible to use models to get at some of the bigger questions of protective pedestrian crossings along major roads like 122<sup>nd</sup>, perhaps using data-driven pedestrian level-of-service. Drennan responded that she does not think the model would be used to say exactly how many crossings there would be, but instead how much protection pedestrians would need at a crossing with a given traffic volume. PedPDX guidelines also help determine points of distance between crossings, and PBOT's Traffic Safety team helps review proposed crossings. Szigethy added that traffic modeling was able to help understand how to coordinate the additional traffic signals on Division.

Another member mentioned they appreciate the system- and area-wide modeling, asking if the models used gave any surprising or counterintuitive results. Szigethy answered that the software showed traffic conditions improving along a particular street segment after a reorganization but a lot of traffic was sent to other streets. One program was redistributing a lot more trips than the other, and it is hard to say which one is objectively correct. However, he added that this model matches anecdotal reality as people tend to find other driving routes. Drennan said that she finds the notion of the road getting a lot better does not make much sense; if people accept a certain level of delay, they will continue to accept that level of delay. She added that it was surprising not to see impacts on parallel N 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue but big impacts on east-west streets.

A member asked if the model that produces more diversions matches completed road reorganizations' before and after conditions. Drennan responded that PBOT is tracking that but has not had as much of an opportunity to do so in east Portland. Cawley did that comparison on the road reorganizations she was describing as well as E Burnside and Division from 60<sup>th</sup> to 82<sup>nd</sup>. PBOT is looking to see what happens on these roads. She added that on Glisan from 122<sup>nd</sup> to 162<sup>nd</sup>, PBOT used a different modeling program to estimate travel time, which ended up being fairly accurate.

**8:25-8:30: Public Comment** (5 min)

***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.*