

SWNI TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

July 26, 2010 Minutes (Revised based on comment at September 20, 2010 meeting)

Chairs: Marianne Fitzgerald

Arnold Creek:

Ashcreek: Roger Averbek

Bridlemile:

Collins View:

Crestwood:

Far SW:

Hayhurst:

Hillsdale: Don Baack

Homestead: Anton Vetterlein

Maplewood: Karen Williams

Markham:

Marshall Park:

Multnomah: Kay Durtschi

S Burlingame: Sandy Morgan

S Portland:

SWHRL: Andrew Holtz

WPP: Jim McLaughlin

Guests: April Bertelsen

Staff: Leonard Gard

Visitors: John Gould, Rick Seifert, Wes Risher, Glenn Bridger, Robert Hamilton, Peter DiGreshenzo

Minutes, agenda

June TC minutes approved. July agenda approved with addition of updates regarding MTIP funding, Barbur planning, Capitol Hwy CAC, and the Sellwood Bridge. Don Baack will vote for Hillsdale.

Updates:

- Marianne: SWNI did send a letter to Metro regarding MTIP, and JPACT did vote to allocate 75% of funding for active transportation and 25% for freight. But the available money is now less: A half million dollars was subtracted for electric vehicles. We hope that transportation and land use planning for Barbur will continue.
- Roger: The Capitol Hwy open house was well attended. 90 signed in and more came. They went over alignments for bike lanes. Three options for alignments are a) 6-foot bike lanes on each side, b) elevated lanes above the street, and c) separated from the roadway next to landscaping next to the sidewalk. A summary of open house results will be available at the next open house in September. Kay: The room set-up was good with historic information presented first. The history was very useful. Attendees used dots to express preferences on issues. It appeared that pedestrian facilities and preservation of trees were strongly supported.

Sidewalk infill on arterials with April Bertelsen

April reports: A **State of Oregon legislative bill**, House Bill 2001, provides about \$16 million for sidewalks on Portland arterials. About half will be spent on the west side. April distributes

handout. Portland will come up with about sees money of \$407,000 in FY 2010-11 for planning, project selection, and the start of preliminary engineering. Seed money will come from an increase in the gas tax that starts in January 2011 and an increase in vehicle registration fees. The **state** money should come with \$8 million in FY 2011-12 and \$8 million in FY 2012-13.

The sidewalk projects starting on Barbur are from a different pot of money: federal stimulus money. The criteria for those projects are different: they had to be easier, ready-to-do projects where there are existing sidewalks. Criteria for HB 2001 projects will not be so restrictive but constructability will still be a factor because PBOT wants to stretch dollars as much as possible. On the other hand, if a project has high priority, it can be done even if more expensive. We are looking for wins. We are targeting arterials: collectors and major traffic streets. PBOT is looking for projects that meet all the criteria and then they'll look at additional priorities that will cause some projects to bubble up to the top.

Don proposes adding tourist attractor as a criterion, and objects to criteria that don't cover trails. April responds saying the streets must be arterials; if an arterial does have trail status, it is not excluded. Some factors not treated as base criteria could come back as helping in the prioritization. April notes there are many projects listed on years-old plans that are still unfunded. PBOT will look for such projects in plans like the TSP and pedestrian master plan.

Roger asks about crossings. Aprils says there is a separate pot of money for crossings, and PBOT will look for synergy possibilities. Wes notes that safety should be a criterion. April says safety is understood as an underlying factor because all projects are intended to improve safety. Don says that sidewalks should not be the sole emphasis, that widened shoulders could be appropriate in some places for funding.

Roger says that traffic speeds and volumes should be considered. Andrew says that street segments where high school students must, per PPS rules, walk to TriMet stops should also be a factor in prioritizing. In response to a question from Robert, April says PBOT's system of choosing project will be both quantitative and qualitative.

April reports there are outstanding issues. Example: should PBOT seek supplemental funding from abutting property owners? City is concerned about political opposition and equity questions about affordability. PBOT is considering taking dedications of ROW with payment to the property owner. Another idea: subsidizing the work with a matching grant program, or raising funds locally for projects. Wes notes that charter language requires abutting owners to pay, and he asks if the city will change the charter if it's not willing to post owners to pay. April doesn't see a conflict with the charter. Kay says we need consistency in the policy as to when property owners are required to contribute.

April reports that the 1998 Pedestrian Design Guidelines will be the starting point for sidewalk design. But she notes that not all projects can be done per the guidelines, and the guidelines documents do talk about alternative and interim standards. So on a case by case basis they may look at alternatives. There is a hierarchy set out on page D9. But they will start out with sidewalks as the standard, not widened shoulders, because widened shoulders offer only marginal safety and access. There is an ADA issue also. But if the site is constrained, it might be

a candidate for an alternative standard like a widened shoulder. Don supports widened shoulders, noting they give 80% of the value with 20% of the cost. Wes disagrees, saying that we deserve quality projects. He likes curbs for safety reasons. There is also an issue of streets that have a level of use greater than expected for their street classifications.

Don asks for data indicating what additional safety is provided by curb and sidewalk projects. Jim asks Don to provide data on the safety of widened shoulders. Don and April do not have data on the levels of safety of curbs and sidewalks and of widened shoulders. Peter notes that it is a fact in SW Portland that pedestrians are sometimes forced to walk in roadways. He says this is clearly bad, and even without data, widened shoulders are clearly an improvement.

Andrew asks about stormwater requirements. April says PBOT must follow the city's stormwater management manual. But she notes that the sidewalks they build and trees they plant are themselves stormwater management tools. Without sidewalks, rainwater landing near the roadway will usually run quickly into the ditch beside the roadway. But sidewalks can divert water in the opposite direction away from the roadway, thus allowing some percolation. Roger notes that a practical difference between sidewalks and widened shoulders is that the city may have the responsibility to maintain widened shoulders while abutting owners have the responsibility to maintain sidewalks. The following conversation with April suggests that it may not be legally clear who has the responsibility to maintain widened shoulders.

April reports that although it's not clearly stated in the criteria, the city will give city-maintained streets preference in the HB 2001 project list, as opposed to ODOT-maintained streets like Barbur or Macadam.

April reports on timeline:

1. By the fall, PBOT hopes to choose its "universe" of candidate projects that meet the base criteria.
2. Then they'll evaluate projects for feasibility, looking at what is low-hanging fruit and what is more complex. They'll look at priorities that cause some projects to bubble up.
3. Then they'll come back to the community, i.e., district coalitions, to report. PBOT also has a pedestrian advisory committee. The PAC will participate in project selection.

Marianne: We still have our first tier projects. They haven't changed.

Rick objects to the Hilldale process and how the NA came up with recommendations. He says Hilldale NA did not vote on them. Don says there was a vote the favored Capitol Hwy from Cheltenham to Terwilliger.

Marianne continues: We have a second tier list from the NAs, and we had criteria to follow. Project proposals came from NA presidents and NA transportation committees. To be equitable, one idea might be to split the SWNI area into quadrants and choose one project from each.

In answer to question from John, April says that PBOT hopes that the HB 2001 funding will be the beginning of a longer program that will get other funding as the program continues.

Discussion without resolution takes place regarding situation of two NAs supporting one project and whether that should elevate its priority. April notes that shared priorities are OK.

Marianne asks that each NA within the next month give her their one highest priority project. It would be good to winnow down the process. We'll meet again in September. April says September is not too late. PBOT's prioritizing will go on through the fall and winter. Marianne says that in September we'll list each NA top priority on a chart and use dots to indicate our favorite projects, and see if any projects bubble to the top. April will come back a TC meeting in late winter.

April says that doing sidewalks on just one side of a street is still on the table. It could turn out to be the most feasible, cost-effective solution. But PBOT will look first at doing both sides.

Announcements

Marianne asks whether anyone is interested in a field trip riding Portland's light rail network. Committee agreed.

On August 2 there will be a community town hall at city hall to discuss the city's agenda for legislative action in the next session of the Oregon legislature, i.e., what new laws Portland should lobby for. April says city bureaus are currently discussing what positions they'll take. PBOT will have requests for new laws for the vehicle code and regarding trail liability.

End of meeting.