

City of Portland  
**Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meeting**



**Tuesday, July 16, 2024**  
**6:00 – 8:00 PM**

**6:00-6:10 – Public Comment** (10 min)

- Kala Franklin: Comment about a PSA for road rage. There was an incident on a walk recently where a person riding a motorcycle sped up towards them, shouted a slur, spit, and then sped off. A driver sped towards them right after. Interested in road rage and what is being done policy-wise about it.
  - Gena Gastaldi (PBOT liaison to the PAC): I can follow up with the Vision Zero team to see what's being done. We have your email.
- Sarah Iannarone, executive director of the Street Trust, had two comments.
  1. The state transportation spending package is an exciting opportunity to increase investment in active transportation. The Street Trust has been working to coordinate a community coalition that puts safety first and is equity-focused. Check out the platform and consider joining if you work with an organization. <https://linktr.ee/ORtranspo2025>
  2. On the Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge, the Street Trust fought hard to get 17' of space for people walking and biking in the bridge design. The feds recently awarded \$1.5B for the interstate bridge replacement (I-5) in part because of the unanimity around a Locally Preferred Alternative that made the grant possible. The Street Trust is seeing a lack of appetite from the feds and the states to fund this bridge. Don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good, or we risk missing the opportunity to bring in extra funding. Contact [sarah@thestreettrust.org](mailto:sarah@thestreettrust.org).
- Doug Klotz: Sent Gena an email about corners. Why is there so much concrete out there? Do we have to have paved spaces on either side of the curb ramps at each corner? He approves of the work on upper Hawthorne, with 2 ramps at each corner and smaller corner radii to slow turning vehicles, but many ramps elsewhere seem to have more concrete than needed.
  - Gena: It's unclear why that is. She forwarded Doug's message to various people at PBOT and has gotten mixed messages; she will try to follow up.
  - Oliver Crawford (PAC member): Thinks the main reason "wings" are preferred to curbing is that curbing can be a tripping hazard and a liability for municipalities. The reason for the extra triangle of concrete between ramps could be because of mowing. There may be other reasons.

**6:10-6:25 – Committee Business** (15 min)

- Hot Topics
  - Gena will be out of town for the PAC meeting in August. She has put out a call for agenda items but hasn't heard anything. The PAC could cancel the August meeting (like last year) if a lot of folks will be out of town. We can still have a meeting if there are people here who have topics they'd like to hear about.

- Tiel Jackson (PAC Co-chair): Let's poll people to see if they'll be in town and decide to keep or cancel the meeting.
  - September could be a good time for the PAC walking tour. Gena has some route ideas, but if PAC members have projects or places they'd like to walk, let us know. The PAC has done a downtown public plaza walk and 82nd Ave in the past.
  - Walk Portland is an ongoing project focused on developing a downtown pedestrian wayfinding strategy. It's a partnership between PBOT and Travel Portland, funded by Travel Portland. Sparks + Sullivan is the consultant. There is an exhibit open at the Portland Visitor Center (1132 SW Harvey Milk St) open to the public until June 30. If you'd like to visit, or want a guided walkthrough the exhibit for you or your organization, let Gena know. Gena will follow-up with PAC members via email.
- Fatal Crash Report
  - 10 people died in crashes since the last meeting.

### **6:25-7:10 – 2025 State Legislative Session - Potential Transportation Funding Package preparations (45 min)**

*PBOT Intergovernmental Policy and Resources Analyst, Sara Wright, provided information about a potential transportation funding package being discussed ahead of the 2025 state legislative session.*

- Sara Wright channels PBOT expertise/priorities to the Office of Government Relations which then balances that with all the other priorities from the city. So the city's ultimate position may not necessarily reflect PBOT's priorities. The conversation around a transportation funding package is evolving and things will change quickly as the 2025 legislative session approaches.
- The bill will likely be focused on maintenance and operations funding, but the conversation could change over time (and possibly become more project-focused as in HB2017) due to politics.
- See the presentation for details.

### **PAC Questions**

- Ken Hanes (PAC member): If tiered registration fees for vehicles are considered, is there any discussion about applying that to the weight of light vehicles?
  - Answer: Yes. Whether that issue becomes important enough to be included in a bill is unknown.
- Tiel (request): Can Sara & Gena make sure the PAC is notified of the next listening session?
- Tiel (question): On behalf of OR Walks/PAC Co-Chair Tabitha, is the city advocating for funding for SRTS, specifically in terms of remediating sidewalk gaps and crossing gaps near schools?
  - Sara: The main focus is on operations and maintenance up front. Where there are opportunities for more funding on safety, PBOT will support those. Without maintenance and ops funding, the bureau can't do the other things. We can't restripe on broken roads, can't install signal priority on a stop light that needs replacing or upgrading, etc.
- Jana Olsen (PAC member): Is there something that we as a PAC can do to be helpful here?
  - Sara: The City of Portland can do what it can do as a lobbying entity. There is a fair amount of constraints on that. PAC's effect is internal to the city. I will talk to my team and get back to you.
- Rebecca Sanders (PAC member): How can we as individuals be most effective? She met with her state representative today and talked to them about transportation funding and one thing they said is, "this isn't my area and I can't guarantee I will have a voice." But they will still be

voting on legislation. Are there specific people—senators, representatives who are dialed into this issue—so people can focus their energy where it will matter?

- Sara: Some legislators are not interested in transportation, but even if they don't care, they need to know the constituents do. There is a perception among some lawmakers that once it comes out of the transportation committee it's good to go. But some legislators have had regrets after they realize what they just voted for. Members of the transportation committee will have a lot more meaningful influence on a legislative package a lot earlier in the process. Talk to other advocates about specific people to talk to; that's a political calculation.
- Lindsay Huber (PAC member): If you or your organization are interested in this package and want to get involved, join the [Move Oregon Forward Coalition](#).

### **7:10-8:00- PAC Discussion time (50 min)**

*The committee will resume the conversation from June's meeting about the Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge, including ramp options, detour routes, and a potential committee letter.*

- Tiel: The County is not planning to have any pedestrian access to/from the bridge on the east end of the bridge except at the bridgehead; no connection to the Eastbank Esplanade. She finds that unacceptable. The ramp options presented were described as too expensive and they were really elaborate. Seems like something simpler could have been developed.
- Mark Raggett (PAC member): Agrees. The connection exists today, it should be replaced. It does not meet ADA, it's just stairs. The county is trying to do it without stairs and elevators. Having access to the esplanade would seem to increase/promote walking. Distances across the bridge are large, and without a connection to an esplanade and the rest of the pedestrian network there is less utility from the new bridge.
- Rebecca: Agrees that ped access to the esplanade should be maintained/replaced.
- Tiel: Sarah Iannarone's testimony seemed to suggest that we could hold this thing up because we're asking too much of this. Do we just give up? What about making the bridge pedestrian-connection-ready?
- Sean Doyle (PBOT staff support): The county is making the bridge streetcar-ready for a potential streetcar along Burnside. Seems they could make the bridge pedestrian connection-ready.
- Rebecca: If we go back to the city's policy of pedestrians being at top of the modal hierarchy, Tiel's idea of something rather than nothing here would link this to a future pedestrian investment. Seems to be a good way to get to a later investment while not letting the perfect be the enemy of the good.
- Mark: Is there another connection that we would like instead of the ramp connection?
- Rebecca: Has there been outreach to the disability community?
- Denver Igarra (PBOT Supervising Planner): Our ADA coordinator has been tracking this closely and does outreach to people with disabilities. She may know who has been engaged or have insights. We can follow up with here.
- Gena: From Ped Design Guide: "Where topography is too steep for a path, a staircase may be used. Per ADA requirements, an alternate accessible path must be available and signage identifying that alternate route must be posted. The alternate accessible path requirement may be met along the existing street network (designs should meet accessibility guidelines to the maximum extent possible). If a stairway is built, it must meet ADA standards for stairways."

- Tiel: We should look into whether the existing stairs are ADA-compliant. That would make our case stronger for maintaining the stair connection.
- Gena: The stairway was built after 2001 when the esplanade was built.
- Ken: If it was built after ADA was law, did they not make it compliant?
- Tiel: Thinking about seismic needs in construction is relatively new. Would guess that was not a big consideration.
- Mark: The politics of the time was also very different. There was a lot of interest in making these kinds of connections and improvements to regional attractions. Had a mayor who was very project-oriented (the esplanade is named after her).
- Ken: If ADA & liquefaction are separate issues, do they want the liquefaction issue to be dealt with because they think it would be nice to do or because it would be a liability?
- Tiel: Action post-meeting: Follow up with Lisa. Find out the ADA status of the existing structure. Some of the history of how it was built. Clarify the consequences for the city to remove an ADA-compliant access (assuming it is) and not replacing it.
- Mark: Let's say we don't meet in August and September is a walking tour, do we come back to this in October?
- Gena: Instead of a full group meeting in August, there could be an optional meeting for people who want to continue talking and getting into the weeds on ADA (if Lisa is willing and able to do August).
- Tiel: Into optional meeting, could have a subcommittee that could bring a proposal back to the committee in September.
- Jana/Sean: The impression from the May joint BAC/PAC meeting was that the BAC was not going to write a letter about a ramp and was more concerned with detour routes.