PSC Questions and Staff Responses - Bicycle Parking Code Update Project
January 31, 2019

	Topic	PSC Question	Staff Response
1	**Citywide growth management - Mode split discussion**	When did the city first establish a mode split goal for bikes, and what was it? (Bachrach)	Portland's 1996 Bicycle Master Plan identified a 10-year benchmark (bicycle mode split of 10%) and a 20-year benchmark (bicycle mode split of 15%). Joint City of Portland and Multnomah County Climate Action Plan 2009 established 25% mode split goal for bicycling. That Climate Action Plan goal was carried over in the Portland Bicycle Plan for 2030 (adopted 2010) and ultimately into the city's Transportation System Plan and Comprehensive Plan versions that were adopted in 2018.
2	**Citywide growth management - Mode split discussion**	Does the mode split target for bike commute trips incorporate short-term trips as well as those oriented toward employees? (Bachrach)	The following are Portland's mode split goals: ● Transportation System Plan - 25% bicycle mode split for **commute trips** by 2035 ● Portland Bicycle Plan - 25% bicycle mode split for **all trips** by 2030 The commute trips do not incorporate short-term trips, those short-term trips are incorporated in the goal for **all trips**.
3	**Citywide growth management - Mode split discussion**	What has been the historic trend in meeting the mode split goals for bikes? Is it correct that the mode split has flat-lined at 7% in recent years? Are there surveys or any analysis/ data that helps explain the lack of growth in mode splits for bikes? (Bachrach)	To address the question about Portland's history of meeting bike mode splits, the Attachment A shows census tract maps showing the growth in cycling in different neighborhoods in the City overlaid with the growth in the bicycle network. It is clear that as the bike network is gradually built-up, becoming more dense and complete, ridership also grows. In areas of Portland where riding is convenient and bicycle infrastructure is comfortable, we see bike mode splits above 15%, achieving the previous 2006 mode split goal. However, PBOT recognizes that to date the City has only made modest investments in the bicycle network, leaving much of the city with areas of gaps in the network or facilities that are not adequately comfortable to attract the full spectrum of potential cyclists. PBOT credits the plateau in bike mode split to the need for better bike facilities for more areas of the City, including the Central City, where we have such a high proportion of destinations.

			Attachment B shows the Annual Development of Bikeway Miles by Facility Type. This document shows that early bike infrastructure investments were mostly built as bike lanes and it wasn't until after 2010 that investments in protected bike lanes began. Further, the amount of protected bike infrastructure built to date pales compared to future funded protected facilities: nearly 30 miles of bike boulevards, over 14 miles of buffered bike lanes, 29 miles of protected bike lanes, and 5 miles of separated path are funded for construction in the next 5-10 years. As such PBOT expects significant increases in the City as these projects are built and Portland's bike network becomes increasingly denser and more connected. PBOT project staff and PBOT Planning staff also agree with the points included by Commissioner Smith in his email dated 01/23/19 (see Attachment C).
4	**Citywide growth management - Mode split discussion**	The letter from the PBA states that "PBOT actually proposed lowering the mode split goal to 15 percent due to internal modeling that predicted a far lower mode split", is that correct? (Bachrach)	During the Transportation System Plan update, PBOT did propose a 15% commute mode split. One reason for this number was the inclusion of the percentage of workers who would be working from home. During the PSC deliberations, PBOT increased the commute mode split goal to 25% - recognizing that additional tools such as congestion pricing, shared mobility, e-bikes, parking supply, and parking pricing would help advance bike mode share. The calculations for the proposed long-term bike parking rates for the Bicycle Parking Code Update project used the 15% goal as this was the rate being proposed during the rate calculation phase of this project and significant work by SAC members, deliberating and negotiation these rates, had already occurred. Short-term/visitor parking rates used the 25% all-trip bike mode split goal.
5	**Citywide growth management - Mode split discussion**	How much has the City spent on bike infrastructure in recent years, on what types of projects and what's been the primary source of funding? (Bachrach)	PBOT does not have an accurate breakdown of funding specific to bicycle infrastructure because the majority of projects are making multimodal and not just bicycle improvements. However, see attached map (Attachment D) that shows existing bikeways (blue) and funded bikeways (orange). Also, please see attached list (Attachment B) of annual bikeway miles built by facility type.

6	**Citywide growth management - Mode split discussion**	What types of bike infrastructure projects - and other approaches for improving the mode split - are planned in the next several years? (Bachrach)	Attachment A shows the Annual Development of Bikeway Miles by Facility Type. This document demonstrates that early bike infrastructure investments were mostly built as bike lanes and it wasn't until after 2010 that investments in protected bike lanes began. Further, the amount of protected bike infrastructure built to date pales compared to future funded protected facilities: nearly 30 miles of bike boulevards, over 14 miles of buffered bike lanes, 29 miles of protected bike lanes, and 5 miles of separated path are funded for construction in the next 5-10 years. As such PBOT expects significant increases in the City as these projects are built and Portland's bike network becomes increasingly denser and more connected. PBOT has a number of programs that are aimed at encouraging Portlanders to bike or use other non-SOV modes. These programs include but are not limited to: SmartTrips; Transportation Wallet incentive package; parking pricing policies, including metered zones and area parking permits; BIKETOWN bikeshare; Transportation Demand Management requirements for new development; Safe Routes to School; Sunday Parkways; other encouragement rides targeting specific populations; distribution of bike maps and other education and information resources.
7	**Bicycle Parking Fund**	How much is the fee in lieu for short-term spaces? Why isn't there a fee in lieu for long-term parking? How much money has been collected/ spent by the Bicycle Parking Fund? (Bachrach)	Current fees are in Fee Schedule - Exhibit E: fees range from $134 for 1 spaces to the cap at $26,757 for 22 or more spaces. PBOT is not proposing a long term bicycle parking fund at this time as this proposal raises several issues that concern PBOT: 1) This requires that the City acquire private land for the bicycle parking, with no guarantee that it will be near the development that contributed to the fund. 2) In addition, for the majority of projects there could a be significant lag time until land is acquired and long-term parking could be provided. 3) Costs of this land acquisition, staff time, etc. would make the fund extremely expensive. 4) Security and management - while the city currently manages a bicycle locker program, it is not staffed to manage additional long-term bicycle parking sites. However, for the short-term fund, PBOT and BDS agree to remove the all or nothing provision and allow partial payment into the Short-Term Bicycle

			Parking Fund. The Bicycle Parking Fund has been actively installing racks to meet code requirements for the properties that have paid into since 2004 and staff believe it's been a successful way to ensure that visitor parking is provided when buildings run up against lot lines. From 2003 through 2018, the Fund has collected approximately $1.4 million and spent approximately .9 million.
8	**PBOT bike racks**	How many bike corrals and single racks have been installed in recent years? What's the cost and source of funds for them? Have there been studies analyzing their usage? (Bachrach)	PBOT typically installs anywhere from 300-800 bike spaces per year using sidewalk staple racks (two bike spaces each) or on-street bike corrals (average 14 bike spaces each). To date, approximately 14,500 bike spaces have been installed citywide in the public right-of-way. In addition, PBOT has installed 150+ bike corrals since 2008. All of these PBOT racks are installed outside and are intended to support retail/visitor parking. The cost of racks, installation and staffing for non-Bike Parking Fund racks are budgeted at approximately $50,000 per year which comes from General Transportation Revenue (GTR) funds. Largely, PBOT sidewalk racks and bike corrals are installed at the request of businesses. With the exception of a one-off bike corral utilization study in 2010, PBOT does not analyze usage rates.
9	**Use-Ratio table**	Can you explain the "visitor rate" for short-term spaces was determined? Was a 25% mode split applied to all visitor rates in Standard A? (Bachrach)	Short term bicycle parking is based on the following: 1. **Trip Rate** = Transportation System Development Charge or ITE (Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition). The PM Peak totals were divided in half to only account for one direction (trips into store/ restaurant). 2. **Visitor Rate** = percentage of visitors by use, these were taken from a number of sources including calculations done in Cambridge, MA and Eugene OR. In most cases staff used the more conservative number of visitor rates. 3. **Mode Split** = 25% of all trips a. Standard A = 25% b. Standard B = 15%
10	**Use-Ratio table**	A "visitor rate" of 20% was applied to Office Uses in Standard A. What was the visitor rate for Retail	Per above, three different data points are used to determine the short-term bike parking requirement for Retail Uses:

		Use? What was the rate for restaurants and bars? (Bachrach)	1) Staff used person trips rates (those established by the TSDC) to establish total trips per use category: ● Retail Use = 2 person trips per 1,000 sq. ft. per PM Peak ● Restaurants and Bars = 5.6 person trips per 1,000 sq. ft. per PM Peak 2) From this total (one way) trip amount, the percentage of visitors is determined. The visitor rate used for both Retail Use and Retail - Restaurants and Bars was 75%. It is the higher Trip Rates of Restaurants and Bars (5.6 persons per 1,000 sq ft) versus Retail Use (2 persons per 1,000 sq. ft.) that accounted for a higher short-term bicycle parking requirement.
11	**Use-Ratio table**	The proposed regulations call for a fivefold increase in the number of short-term spaces for restaurants and bars. Can you explain how the visitor rate and demand analysis support such a significant increase? Is there any comment about the increase from the business owners? (Bachrach)	Current code includes one Retail use category and therefore did not specify a different rate for Restaurants and Bars. Staff routinely saw insufficient bicycle parking at bar/restaurants to meet current bike demand, further demonstrated by requests for additional PBOT sidewalk racks at these new locations. The inclusion of a new specific use category for Restaurant and Bar is a response to the high bike parking demand that Portland eating and drinking establishments have. Further, requiring more visitor bike parking for a separate Restaurant and Bar specific use category is typical in other cities, including Seattle, WA and San Francisco, CA. Below are a few Portland examples in the Restaurant and Bar Use Category, and how many short-term racks are required in current code vs. proposed code: 1. Zipper (2705 NE Sandy Blvd) - 7,763 sq. ft. Current Short-term Requirement = 2 spaces (1 rack) Proposed Short-term Requirement = 8 spaces (4 racks) 2. Radio Room (1101 NE Alberta St.) - 4,550 sq. ft. Current Short-term Requirement = 2 spaces (1 rack) Proposed Short-term Requirement = 5 spaces (3 racks) 3. Hopworks (2944 SE Powell Blvd) - 13,050 sq. ft. Current Short-term Requirement = 2 spaces (1 rack) Proposed Short-term Requirement = 14 spaces (7 racks)

12	**Small unit development**	Did PBOT consider an exemption for smaller housing developments or at least some reduction or flexibility in how the regulations apply? (Bachrach)	The Proposed Draft includes a proposal to exempt smaller, affordable housing developments from the 20% in-unit limit, and instead allow all long-term bicycle parking to be within a dwelling unit for projects of under 10 dwelling units. This proposal targets smaller sites where there is less room to provide separate bicycle parking rooms. (p.58-59) The proposal in the Proposed Draft states: *For projects with under 10 dwelling units, where at least 50 percent of the dwelling units are affordable to those earning no more than 100 percent of the area median income, up to 100 percent of required long-term bicycle parking spaces may be provided in dwelling units. All other in-unit standards in Subsubparagraph D.1.a.(4)., above must be met. To qualify the applicant must provide a letter from the Portland Housing Bureau certifying that the development meets this standard and any administrative requirements of the Portland Housing Bureau. The letter must be submitted before a building permit can be issued for the development but is not required in order to apply for a land use review.*
13	**Geographic Tiers**	I can understand why staff aligned the tiers with the pattern areas, but it seems to me that aligning with the centers and corridors would better align with our goals. Please advise if staff looked into a centers and corridors approach and if so, why was it decided to use the pattern areas instead? (Schultz)	During the SAC process staff and SAC members debated whether the Centers and Corridors approach would be a better alignment to distinguish higher and lower bike parking rates. The SAC decided to pursue geographic tiers using the Inner and Outer Pattern Areas for the following reasons: - Portland has seen from its own experience that biking rates are higher in inner neighborhoods that are closer to Central City. - Higher biking rates closer to the central city are also found in other major biking cities. - A typical "bikeshed" (distance easily bikeable) is approximately 3 miles, or significantly less with elevation or road connectivity barriers. While centers and corridors refer generally to places where development is concentrated, they are too small to accommodate the areas of Portland that can easily be reached by bike. For the Commissioners consideration see Attachment E, two maps of Portland's Centers and Corridors designations.

14	**Long-term standards: weather protection**	I would like additional information as to the requirement that 100% of long-term bikes should be covered. I am concerned about the cost and complications. Was there any consideration for a percentage of covered vs. non-covered area? (Schultz)	Current code says that 50% of required long-term bicycle parking must be covered. The proposal amended the long-term requirement to 100% in order to ensure that employees, students, multi-dwelling residents have the ability to protect their bicycles from the elements. Rain, hot sun, and other weather not only deteriorates bicycle components (can rust chains, deteriorate gears and seats, etc.) but also can make daily riding extremely unpleasant (wet bike seat and wet handles for example).
15	**Long-term standards: Location**	Page 55: Item D.1.a.(1) – what is the intent of the clarification "including on the ground floor or on individual building floors." Wouldn't both be within the building? Is elevator access required? If so, I do not see it stated here and may need to be added. (Schultz)	Yes, this language could be eliminated in lieu of "within the building." The current Proposed Draft does not articulate access requirements to common bike rooms, as per building code, common bike rooms must be accessible, which would mean an elevator is required if common bike rooms were to be placed on other floors. To reinforce this requirement, the Discussion Draft (p49) included the following language: *"Access Requirements. a. Bicycle parking must be accessed through a route that does not require the lifting of a bicycle over any obstacles, including stairs, steps or curbs."* This language was removed at the request of BDS. However, if a building without an elevator was to include in-unit bicycle parking, these long-term spaces would need to be placed in ground floor units. This language is included in the Proposed Draft, p.57 *"For buildings with no elevators, required long-term bicycle parking must be located in the ground floor units."*
16	**Schools**	Page 65: 3.a – the code states that "all required spaces located outside of the building must be in a horizontal rack? The commentary states that this is because students may have difficulty using vertical racks. I can understand grade school students may have a difficult time, but not high school students. Please clarify the intent. (Schultz)	Yes, the intent is to ensure easy access for elementary and middle school students.
17	**In-unit**	Note: I find the following statement on p. 23 misleading: "finally, there is policy direction, from	Chairman Schultz is correct in that the language in the staff report paraphrases the Bike Plan for 2030, which acknowledges *spaces designated*

		the adopted Bicycle Plan for 2030 to prohibit space within dwelling units for required long term bicycle parking." The policy statement is to "…prohibit space within dwelling units…not specifically designed for bicycle parking…from counting towards long-term bicycle parking requirements." This policy would allow a bike parking space in a unit as long as the space is designed to accommodate a bike – such as a storage area with the appropriate clearances. (Schultz)	*specifically for bike parking*; the full text was included on the bottom of the page. At the time of the drafting of the Bicycle Plan for 2030, long-term bicycle parking could be provided in the individual dwelling units without any racking system. This option had been problematic—as at time of permit, developers often indicated that bikes would be allowed to be accommodated in individual units. However later, building management would apply different policies that did not allow residents to store bicycles within the unit. At the time of the Bike Plan drafting, RICAP 5 was responding by applying long-term requirements for the in-unit requirement as a way to indicate that a space was designed for bike parking. These RICAP 5 changes included requiring a 2'x6' space and maneuvering zone to be designated on plans and requiring a physical bike rack. However, since RICAP 5 was completed in 2010, staff's position on allocating dwelling unit space towards bike parking has evolved. Staff believe that dedicating in-unit space for bike parking is not best practice due to the inconveniences associated with needing to bring your bike into the unit. This position was directly influenced by community feedback, from apartment dwellers, property managers, and from our best practice scans from other cities.
19	**Provision of rack detail information**	BDS does typically required bike parking information to be provided at the time of land use review. When a project is going thru a Type II or Type III review, that means very detailed information ends up being provided at a stage when a project in early into it's design. The timing is inappropriate. Bike parking requirements should be reviewed at the time of permit submittal. I understand that BDS has concerns an applicant will not provide sufficient area for bike parking if they do not have the full details dimensions at the time of land use review, but it is the applicant's responsibility to meet code. Showing an area for bike parking at the time of zoning application should be sufficient with details as to clearances and racks being submitted at the time of permitting.	BDS believes that at both Land Use Review, as well as at Permitting, we should be asking for: ● layout of bike areas, as well as ● specifications for bike racks to check to see if the code is met, because there are specific requirements in the code for both of these. So, the request for a bike rack specification at Land Use Review (as well as numerous other items, such as Ground Floor Window Diagrams) is intended to help the applicant find out if they are meeting code at a time in the process where they have flexibility to either change their design, or request Adjustments and/or Modifications to the code. Applicants aren't necessarily locked into rack type or design, but this information is extremely useful in evaluating a project and staff's recommendation is that it be done as early as possible.

		(Schultz)	BDS staff do typically ask for additional information to ensure that the bicycle rack and location meets code, however this is not standard across all BDS planners. Further, PBOT staff have seen many examples of private development bicycle racks that were installed but do not meet code requirements. These errors are not typically caught by BDS inspectors.
20	**Short-term standards: Security**	I would like to know reasons why we can't have cameras on short term (unless I missed it -- if so please point it out). I have heard many stories about bicycles being stolen in East Portland by people running errands and parking safely with personal locks in well trafficked places like in front of Winco, Fred Meyers, and near the entrance to 24 hr fitness at Mall 205. Why stay away from mandating cameras? I am thinking it could be required for short term bicycle parking in front of public establishments of a certain size. Tell me why this is not a good idea. (Larsell)	The proposals in the Proposed Draft are centered around providing physical security for **required long-term bicycle parking (for employees, students, or residents)**. We know and have seen the inadequacies of relying solely on a security camera, that may or may not be working at the time, or on a security guard that isn't actually present 24 hours a day. Therefore, for long-term bicycle parking the proposal states that security is to be provided by a locked/ restricted access room, cage, etc. or an individual bicycle locker. The one thing here to also note, is that for **short-term bicycle parking (for visitors)**, which is likely the type of parking you are addressing for the Mall 205 24 Hour Fitness, the current and proposed code relies on the proximity to the main entrance to provide a level of security for these shorter stays and does not propose any additional security measures. During early project discussions, there wasn't a lot of talk about additional security measures for short-term bicycle parking. We also know that there are a lot of issues with relying solely on a security camera and there are potential additional operating costs to requiring security cameras outside a building. Although, this issue of security concerns for short term visitor parking, is absolutely an issue that we are seeing and hearing about from the community.

21	**Use-Ratio table**	Transit Centers and Light Rail Stations. Where there's a park & ride associated with a station (or expectation that bikes would be used for the 'last mile' to get to the station), these seem low to me. Could we increase the bike parking standard for those situations? Thinking about bike lock areas at transit hubs I've seen in the Netherlands and Germany, I wonder if there might be a place for a middle-ground between long- and short-term bike parking more appropriate for mass bike storage (e.g. more like short term biking standard, but also covered). Lastly, what exactly triggers the requirement to provide bike parking at transit centers and light rail stations? E.g. designation of the train/bus stop? Permitting of the structure at the station? (Spevak)	The following are the requirements for the various transit related use categories in code. <u>Please note that these requirements are the same for both Standard A and Standard B:</u> ● Transit Centers: ○ Long-term: 30 spaces ○ Short-term: 12 spaces ● Light Rail Stations: ○ Long-term: 12 spaces ○ Short-term: 4 spaces ● Park and Ride: ○ Long-term: 12, or 5 per acre ○ Short-term: 6 spaces In regard to a middle ground design standard that falls between short and long-term parking: For school sites, staff did propose conditions for long-term bicycle parking (intended mostly for students), where the proposal requires that the bike parking must be covered but not necessarily enclosed. In this scenario, the security will somewhat be addressed by proximity to the main entrance, which is typically a consistently high traffic zone, during the school day. A transit center, light rail station, or park and ride would not have this level of informal security. TriMet has been moving to more, slightly larger scale, restricted access bike rooms/ cages, as opposed to bike lockers, which allow for more bicycle parking. 'Restricted access' for TriMet's latest Goose Hollow Bike & Ride facility means using a registered Hop Fastpass. The triggers are, any new transit center, light rail station (usually only happens with a new line), or new park and ride. Depending on the transit center, there may also be triggers under nonconforming development. If the transit centers or light rail stations are in the right-of-way, the Zoning Code doesn't apply. However, in the past, TriMet and the City have developed bicycle parking proposals for the complete transit line, using code requirements as the baseline for those discussions.
22	**Use-Ratio table**	Parks and Open Areas. A requirement of 1 short term space per 2 or 3 acres seems super low, at	Similar to how we broke out Restaurants and Bars as a Specific Use under the Retail Use, staff could parse out different types of parks in the table.

		least for urban parks. I think Khunamask Park (near my house) has many times this ratio. Consider increasing? Or maybe Parks voluntarily provides more parking than required but other Open Space uses (E.g. cemeteries) need less? (Spevak)	The following are some possible specific uses that are included under Parks and Open Areas in 33.920: parks, golf courses, cemeteries, public squares, plazas, recreational trails, botanical gardens, boat launching areas, nature preserves, off-site mitigation, community gardens, and land used for grazing that is not part of a farm or ranch. The following are some possible specific uses that are included under Community Service in 33.920: libraries, museums, senior centers, community centers, publicly owned swimming pools, youth club facilities, hospices, ambulance stations, drug and alcohol centers, social service facilities, mass shelters or short term housing when operated by a public or non-profit agency, vocational training for the physically or mentally disabled, crematoriums, columbariums, mausoleums, soup kitchens, park-and-ride facilities for mass transit, and surplus food distribution centers. Commissioner Spevak has asked staff to work on possible amendment to address his concerns.
23	**Clerical**	(p.55) Section D.1.a(1). Change "Within the building" to "Within a building" (clerical, given that there may be more than 1 building) (Spevak)	Staff can make that wording change.
24	**Long-term standards**	Consider allowing time-of-use flexibility to reduce total bike (or car) storage capacity in mixed-use situations where bike storage for one use (e.g. residential) is compatible with a different use (e.g. office). Alternatively, allow such flexibility to be considered through an adjustment process. (Spevak)	The Motor Vehicle Parking section of 33.266 does allow for "joint use parking". The following is the code language: *3. Joint use parking. Joint use of required parking spaces may occur where two or more uses on the same or separate sites are able to share the same parking spaces because their parking demands occur at different times. Joint use of required parking spaces is allowed only if the uses and housing types to which the parking is accessory are allowed in the zone where the parking is located. Joint use of required parking spaces is allowed if the following documentation is submitted in writing to BDS as part of a building or zoning permit application or land use review:* *a. The names and addresses of the uses and of the owners or tenants that are sharing the parking;* *b. The location and number of parking spaces that are being shared;* *c. An analysis showing that the peak parking times of the uses occur*

			at different times and that the parking area will be large enough for the anticipated demands of both uses; and *d. A legal instrument such as an easement or deed restriction that guarantees access to the parking for both uses.* Staff would want to make sure a similar level of documentation and review is applied if joint use bicycle parking is included. Finally, the following are concerns from staff regarding joint use bicycle parking: 1. Unlike motor vehicle parking, which is always located outside of a building, there are definite access issues to consider for joint use bicycle parking. It will be vital to ensure that if the bicycle parking is to be joint use, that all tenants will have appropriate access. 2. The proposed amendments distinguish long-term security requirements for residential uses and all other uses. Therefore, for joint use bicycle parking that includes a residential use, staff would propose that the higher, residential security standard be used. 3. Residential Uses are 24 hour uses as there is no guarantee that every resident that is parking in a bicycle parking room will remove their bike every day and free up space for a user of another use. Potentially, staff could support a scenario of allowing a small percentage of the required long-term bicycle parking to be joint use assuming full access for all users can be guaranteed.
25	**Bike rooms**	Provide an exception to the requirement to extend the cover 2' beyond the bicycle footprint on any side of the structure where the roof and wall collectively create a rain barrier. This addresses the situation where there's long-term bike parking (wall-mounted or otherwise) abutting a perimeter fence or on-site building with a cover extending out from the fence. This sort of long-term bike storage would make a lot of sense in multi-dwelling zones, but I suspect it wouldn't technically could as being 'within a building or a locker'. (Spevak)	If a structure has a roof and is enclosed on at least 50 percent of the area of its side, then it is a building. Therefore, this cover projection applies when not in a building. The scenario described seems like it would meet the definition of a building, and therefore would be exempt from the 2' projection. This could be further addressed, if necessary, through an amendment, if there are additional concerns.
26	**Bike rooms**	If it's been a problem or likely to be one, consider	In working with BDS, staff removed some of the specifics around defining an

		adding a limitation to the number and/or width of doors people with bikes have to go through en-route to the long-term bike parking area. Along these lines, does the code need to define 'access routes' to have no steps? Ramp steepness? Currently, it seems silent on these topics. I'm thinking about properties where ADA wouldn't necessarily apply (e.g. small multi-dwelling sites) (Spevak)	access route, like *bicycle parking must be accessed through a route that does not require the lifting of a bicycle over any obstacles, including stairs, steps or curbs*. Staff from BPS, PBOT and BDS agreed that some access routes were reviewed during a Life Safety Review and not during Planning and Zoning Review. ADA requirements, including the provision of an accessible route, must apply to any common room for a Multi-Dwelling or Commercial Building. A bicycle parking room is considered a common room. Therefore, the access route does not need to be addressed in Zoning Code, as it will be addressed during the Life Safety Review, and thus, the reference is removed from the code draft. In the Proposed Draft, staff did add a requirement under the in-unit standards that for buildings with no elevators, required long-term bicycle parking must be located in the ground floor units. This is because ADA requirements don't apply to all dwelling units in a project, therefore this requirement is necessary to ensure accessing required bicycle parking did not involve carrying the bike up the stairs.
27	**Small project development**	I'm concerned about the practicality of these standards for a 50' wide lot situations with 2-4 units on it, particularly if there's a grade change between the street and the main portion of the lot. Zoning code prohibits detached covered structures in the front setback. If you try and attach the bike storage to the building, building code determines it's a mixed-occupancy structure and requires full NFPA 13 sprinkler system. If you put it in the back yard, there may be grade obstacles to overcome to physically get bikes to the long-term storage area - not to mention getting around trees to meet perimeter landscape requirements. Finally, if a structure is more than 120sf or 200sf (depends on threshold), as some would have to be to fit the bike storage dimensional requirements, a building permit would be required. I think it would be designated with an "S" (for storage) occupancy, which layers on commercial building code requirements on setback (up to 10'), fire rating of walls, and limits on openings in wall assemblies	First, staff want to add some clarity for where Bicycle Parking Requirements apply. Currently, to any multi-dwelling structure or development; this generally means a site with 3 or more units. However, under RIP, the definition of multi-dwelling structure and multi-dwelling development is likely to change. Therefore, staff offer two options: 1. Add specificity in Table 266-6, and change "Multi-Dwelling" to "Fourplex, Multi-Dwelling Structures and Multi-dwelling Development." 2. Propose a bicycle parking specific threshold of the minimum number of units on a site that would trigger bicycle parking standards (i.e. 4 units). Note: This threshold was a topic of discussion in the Small Sites Working Group (Spevak, Smith, and Bachrach). The proposal out of that group is that bicycle parking requirements should apply to projects with more than 4 units on a site. As for the additional aspects, regarding sprinkler requirements, etc., these are Building Code issues and are outside the scope of bicycle parking and

		(see table 716.5). I'm not a pro in this stuff, but have certainly been surprised by these requirements in the past that forced me to either move the building 10' away from a property line, build it with CMU block (with no openings near buildings or property lines, which is a bummer for natural light), or figure out a way to make it small enough to not need a permit (which can sometimes be done for trash/recycling areas, but might not be possible to meet dimensional requirements for long term bike storage). There could be solutions to all of the above issues, but it gets complicated enough for small sites with just a few units on them that I'd like to confirm that there really are ways to provide bike parking as described here without running afoul of other codes and/or forcing weird/expensive site planning efforts. (Spevak)	the Zoning Code.
28	**Small project development**	If the short term space requirement gets triggered for a 3-4 unit building on a lot that slopes up from the sidewalk, I think the only way to meet this standard would be to put the short-term bike storage on a concrete pad abutting the sidewalk, surrounded by a retaining wall. If the slope's not too steep, that could be totally reasonable. But if it's fairly steep, as can be found in neighborhoods where streets are dug down and homes on either side are up in the air some, it could drive some pretty tall retaining walls. One option might be an exception for sloped lots (as is being contemplated in RIP for other purposes). Another would be to allow builders to pay into the Bicycle Parking Fund in those situations (which I think would require some adjustment to that language on p. 69, since it might be technically possible to comply with the standard, just very expensive) (Spevak)	The short-term bicycle parking space requirement for any project under 40 units, is two spaces, or one staple rack. In this scenario it would be appropriate for an applicant to pay into the Bicycle Parking Fund, and for one rack (2 spaces) the current cost is, $268.
29	**FAR exemption**	In BHD and RIP, consider excluding bike parking from FAR whether it's in the building or in a	The Proposed Draft includes the FAR exemption for bicycle parking within a building. To add this exemption to Multi-Dwelling Zones or Residential Zones,

		detached structure (to avoid the mixed-occupancy building code problem that arises for shared bike parking rooms) (Spevak)	it will need to be addressed through the BHD or RIP processes. However, note that if the bicycle parking is not in a building (a structure that has a roof and is enclosed on at least 50 percent of the area of its sides), it wouldn't count towards FAR. For example, bike parking underneath a covered structure, open on the sides, with a chain link fence or gate surrounding it, would not count as a building and so wouldn't count as FAR (although it would count as building coverage).
30	**Schools**	Are increases of exterior improvement areas up to 1,500sf already exempt from needing conditional use review? If so, I'm happy with current language. If not, please let me know. (Spevak)	The amendments under 33.281 and 33.815 only refer to Schools and School sites. Which are K-12 schools. All of the language is current, and the amendment only adds bicycle parking to the exemption list. Therefore, the listed uses, now, including bicycle parking are exempt from the limitation, and thus are allowed to be as big as they need to be without requiring conditional use.
31	**Small project development**	What triggers the switch from single dwelling treatment to multi-dwelling? (zoning code or building type)? Would a corner duplex built under current code trigger a long term bike storage requirement? A triplex/fourplex under draft RIP? Would a 1-unit/duplex/triplex/fourplex in single dwelling zoning have a different bike storage requirement than a 1-unit/duplex/triplex/fourplex in a multi-dwelling zoned situation? (Spevak)	The zone assignment is not relevant to the bicycle parking requirements. The bicycle parking standards are based on the Use Category and the development type. See the response above (question #27) for proposed options to add clarity on the trigger for Multi-Dwelling projects.
32	**Small project development**	Confirm that small (1-story, size-limited) covered detached accessory structures will be allowed in setbacks in MD zones (as they're currently allowed in SD zones) regardless of housing type. I think the PSC has straw-poled to make this happen. It would be important to have this option for bike storage in low-density multi-dwelling situations. (Spevak)	It appears that BHD is moving forward with this, but it will be at the discretion of PSC and City Council. Note, this setback allowance does not solve any of the Building Code issues.

Questions from Hearing (January 22, 2019):			
33	**Use/Ratio table**	Would like to know the history of the 110% requirement for South Waterfront? (Smith)	The 110% was added as part of the South Waterfront Plan Zoning Code Update (in 2003), and was included with the locker room requirement. The commentary does not articulate the rationale behind the 110%, it only states: *Locker rooms and additional bicycle parking. These amendments will add a requirement for locker rooms and bike parking in larger commercial projects. This requirement replaces an existing floor area bonus in the district and will encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation into the district, supporting the transportation policies of the district.*
34	**PBOT Programs**	Would like to hear about PBOT programs to address adding bike parking to current schools - *Are there plans to do anything about schools, including existing, not having enough bike parking?* (St Martin)	Yes, PBOT works with Portland Public, David Douglas, Reynolds, Centennial and Parkrose School districts on infrastructure needs and encouragement programming as part of the Safe Routes to School Program. Retrofitting at existing schools to place additional bicycle parking is a high demand from parents but is often severely complicated by school administration challenges, such as space constraints and discrepancies in desired location versus optimal location. However, PBOT funds all school bike parking requests after consulting with school staff and other appropriate parties and receiving approval by the School Districts.
35	**Use/Ratio table**	How will project work with RIP process regarding definition of multi-dwelling use (Larsell)	RIP is creating a specific definition of fourplex and further clarifying multi-dwelling development and structure definitions. See response to question #27 above on possible options for adding clarity for bicycle parking triggers in multi-dwelling development.
36	**Citywide growth management / Mode split discussion**	What is PBOT's prediction of the role of congestion pricing and tolling on mode split? (Baugh)	Mode choice is closely tied to pricing influences, thus the high impact of auto parking pricing in lowering SOV trip rates. Similarly, bike mode commute rate increased dramatically in Portland when gas prices spiked in 2008 (Source: Oregon Fuel Prices Explained). As such, yes, congestion pricing and/or tolling is anticipated to support mode split goals. When these strategies have been implemented in other cities, specifically in ways that do not encourage alternate vehicle routes, such as London and

			Stockholm, results have been impressive. In London, bike trips increased 79 percent from 2001 to 2011, after having stagnated between 1993 and 2001 (Source: TFL Transport in London Report 5, Table 2.2, p23)
37	**PBOT Programs**	Would like to hear PBOT's ideas on how to incentivize retrofitting of additional/improved bike parking for existing buildings. *One option is to convert car to bike parking. If any options have been discussed in the past, like to hear about them.* (Spevak and Bachrach)	Current Proposed Draft language (p94-95): *Replacement of existing parking areas with required bicycle parking. Existing required parking spaces may be converted to bicycle parking to accommodate required bicycle parking minimums. The amount of parking spaces required is reduced by the amount needed to accommodate the minimum bicycle parking required.* Assuming that Commissioners are emphasizing incentives, versus additional requirements - such as the nonconforming development triggers, staff have not identified any ideas to incorporate into code. Except for the nonconforming development triggers, bicycle parking for existing buildings are outside the scope of this Zoning Code project. However, the project has spurred thoughts on how PBOT can support bicycle parking in existing buildings and especially existing, older, affordable housing projects. The Portland Bicycle Plan for 2030 does call for a number of actions to encourage owners of existing buildings to upgrade bicycle parking, including: ● Identify funding opportunities and develop programs to provide financial incentives that promote private party retrofitting of bicycle parking facilities and existing residential and commercial buildings; and ● Develop a program to work with retail and business interests to increase short-term on-site bicycle parking in areas of Portland where on-street bike parking would be more than 50 feet from the entrances to major retail venues. Here are some non-Zoning Code ideas from other cities: ● NYC Bikes in Building legislation (adoption year) requires all existing buildings to allow tenants to bring bicycles into the building if designated bicycle parking is not provided. ● Seattle has put together a guide to improve long-term bicycle parking, including strategies for new and existing buildings. See

			some potential strategies in Chapter 11 (starting on page 84).
38	**Use/Ratio table**	Would like to hear about feasibility and impact of changing residential bike parking requirements from per unit to per bedroom. (Spevak)	This is something staff could explore. Since the Multi-Dwelling amounts were updated in 2010, the SAC and staff did not propose changes to the amounts beyond the changes to the geographic tiers. Santa Monica, CA requires 1 long-term space per bedroom, including studios. For example, a 3-bedroom apartment unit would require 3 long-term bicycle parking spaces.
40	**OHSU**	Would like to hear how the code can accommodate OHSU's request to use existing valet parking towards any future long-term bike parking requirements and how we can overcome the issue of the need for a cover (Bortolazzo)	Staff are working on an amendment at the request of Commissioner Smith. That would add language in both the Marquam Hill Plan District chapter (33.555.295) and the South Waterfront Subdistrict section (33.510.251) to allow existing, uncovered OHSU bike valet to count towards future code requirements.