



Lower Southeast Rising Area Plan Project Advisory Committee Meeting #8 September 26, 2022 | 6:30 – 8:00 pm

Meeting Notes

Meeting started at 6:33 pm

Attendance:

Committee members

Anna Weichsel, Ben Waterhouse, Bevan Augustine, Eleanor Manning, Julie Garner, Meesa Long, Nancy Chapin, Nick Sauvie, Pam Hodge, Scott Goodman, and Tim Williams

City staff

Bill Cunningham, BPS; Bryan Poole, PBOT; Cassie Ballew, BPS; Hector Rodriguez-Ruiz, BPS; Zef Wagner, PBOT

Guests: Stephanie Frederick

Introductions:

One guest joined the meeting, Stephanie Frederick (former Brentwood-Darlington land use chair).

- Name, pronouns, and ice breaker: Favorite/least favorite thing about fall?

Public Comment:

Stephanie Frederick will be running for chair of the Brentwood-Darlington Neighborhood Association and will bring strong support for the Lower SE Rising Project. The neighborhood association will meet on October 6 to elect new board members. Encouraged PAC members to consider becoming board members of the neighborhood association. Commitment is meeting once a month (first Thursdays). Zoom link for 10/6 BDNA board meeting & elections: Meeting ID# 844 7484 3955. Passcode bdna22.

For more info on Brentwood Darlington NA activities see www.brentwood-darlington.org website.

Updates: Public Involvement Summary shared and posted on the project website.

Bryan Poole (PBOT) and Bill Cunningham (BPS) presented.

Bryan shared that the Draft Public Involvement Summary, documenting public input on land use and transportation alternatives, has been posted to the Lower SE Rising PAC webpage. Will be shared publicly via newsletter next week.

Bill reminded the group that the preferred community development scenario that emerged from the public input was the “Centers and Corridors” option. Staff is working on a Preferred Scenario Report that documents the preferred land use and transportation scenarios that resulted from the public input. The draft report will be available in October. Staff will inform the PAC when the report is available.

Review revised transportation maps

Bryan Poole (PBOT) presented.

Bryan shared maps showing potential:

1. Major and Local Street Improvements
2. Bike Network Improvements
3. Bus Network Redesign

For these categories, PBOT staff took public feedback, aligned with the land use concepts, and developed distinct transportation projects for further refinements. The projects include 13 neighborhood greenways, 15 Corridor Improvements, and 11 local street improvements. It will not be feasible to implement all projects once, so prioritization will be needed.

Meesa – Would like clarification on the significance of the numbers shown for each project and whether they indicated prioritization. Bryan indicated that the numbers are for identification, not prioritization. Staff are here to discuss prioritization with the PAC.

Bevan – What does it mean to prioritize? What are the implications if a project is not prioritized? Will a project that is not prioritized stay on the docket? How many are practical and in what timeframe can they happen?

Bryan - Tier 1 projects usually are implemented in 1 – 3 years, and Tier 2 projects happen later. Staff actively pursue funding for Tier 1 projects. Projects in next tiers typically need sustained advocacy to move forward.

Zef – Northwest in Motion provides an example. 5 neighborhood greenways and 5 corridors were in Tier 1, for which staff pursued funding. But a couple Tier 2 projects were also done. Funding is often opportunistic and can happen in conjunction with development. All projects will be on docket, added to Transportation System Plan (TSP) and eligible for funding. Makes sense to have 5-6 projects in in Tier 1 for each category.

Scott – Does the PAC have a role in this? Does it require further community advocacy for projects? Zef responded that advocacy is always helpful, even if a project is identified as a priority. Feedback from the PAC is needed on: how we prioritize, what factors to consider, does the list seem right, are there glaring omissions?

Bryan – moved the conversation to prioritization of the identified projects.

Bevan – The local street improvements parallel to Woodstock are not high priorities. These are mostly paved and improvements are coming with development. Seems to benefit mostly cars. Area south of Woodstock has poor east-west connections. There is no east-west access in the area from Rural up to Woodstock - no ADA accessibility or bicycle access. The Tolman greenway would be great, but it is shown as ending at 52nd and doesn't extend to 42nd. If improvements were to be made to Tolman, need

to include connections between 52nd and 42nd to make more accessible and useful. Bryan noted that this would require paving.

Ben - I agree with Bevan's assessment. The inability to access the heart of Woodstock from the south makes it hard to have an all-ages, all-abilities neighborhood. It's easy enough from Mt. Scott-Arleta, but quite challenging from Brentwood.

Meesa – Is supportive of addressing needs where there is no infrastructure, such as paved streets and sidewalks. There are no improved connections between Duke and Flavel. This area should be a priority for connections and traffic calming.

Zef – Very high cost for constructing new sidewalks (can be millions of dollars for one street) - not practical to add to most streets. Next best is traffic calming to slow traffic and make streets safer for pedestrians and bicycles.

Meesa - I think most people in BD aren't expecting sidewalks... just some sort of traffic calming and increased pedestrian safety since we don't have the infrastructure at all right now.

Anna – Agrees that the focus should be on improvements where few improvements exist. 52nd is a barrier to cross, partially due to streets that do not connect across. Solutions look very technical. Something to do would be to investigate how people actually use streets, where they cross streets, etc. Is there a simpler way to make improvements, such as adding a small strip of asphalt to unimproved streets, rather than full improvements? Lack of crossings, including on 45th, make it difficult to get to transit. Are there other ways of investigating issues and possible solutions? Julie – agrees that 52nd is scary to cross, also 72nd.

Zef – Could prioritize crossings on streets with transit.

Tim – Any way to apply a “realistic factor”? What is feasible? Are we asking too much? Could it be good to prioritize some improvements that are more realistic to do? Bryan responded that this is something we should consider, but recommends not limiting ourselves at this point, but to talk about priorities. There is not a set dollar amount for allocating to projects.

Zef – We can say that some projects are more likely to fund, such as neighborhood greenway projects. There is not a clear source of funding for new street paving. Other areas have already been identified for improvements with the funds that do exist.

Scott – Would love to see SE Tolman as a greenway, however, we should speak with folks who live further east to see what their priorities are. There are already a lot of amenities close to the Woodstock main street. Lower-income areas and their needs should be a priority. Bryan replied that equity can be a criterion for prioritization.

Potential street improvements – 52nd Avenue

Bryan moved the discussion to focus on the types of improvements that could be included in projects. He shared potential SE 52nd Improvements. Options for the segment from Flavel to Duke could involve removing parking from one side of the street to provide more space for bicycle lanes. An option for the segment north of Duke would remove parking on both sides of the street to fit bike lanes due to the narrower curb-to-curb dimension.

Julie – Traffic is very fast moving on 52nd. Feels unsafe riding a bicycle. Like the idea of having parking located between the bike lane as traffic to serve as a buffer, but can be tricky for people have to cross the bike lane to get to cars. Like the first option better than the second. Supports anything that can improve 52nd for bicycles. Scott and Bevan support Julie’s comments.

Zef – Main reasons for the second option is that the costs are just for paint. More funding is needed for first option, when parking is located between bicycle lane and traffic. May involve removing more parking near driveways and intersections, so there are trade-offs to consider.

Anna – Supports bike lanes separated from traffic - this is what I grew up with. Would be better if the bike lanes are elevated to same level as pedestrians. Bryan – Staff would like this too, but it’s a matter of funding.

Bevan – Is option 1 objectively safer than option 2? Bryan – Preliminary studies have shown that option 1 is safer, but needs visibility at intersections. Intersection and driveways are where the conflicts often happen.

Zef – Feasibility of option 1 depends on number of driveways and intersections. Parking-protected bike lanes don’t work very well when there are frequent driveways. There are some long stretches on 52nd where you could get good projection by parked cars. Option 1 is generally safer, and can be appropriate on a higher traffic street such as 52nd.

Julie – One thing that would help with the second option is if there could be plastic wands installed between traffic and bike lanes. Bryan – This only works when there is no on-street parking.

Potential street improvements – 72nd Avenue

Bryan – Shared potential options for 72nd Avenue. Has only 40 feet from curb to curb. Adding bike lanes with buffers on both sides would mean removing all on-street parking (option 1), although a second option could preserve parking on one side with narrower unbuffered bike lanes. Something to consider is impacts on future development along 72nd, such as the idea of new development with commercial services.

Julie – 72nd is actually worse than 52nd in terms of cars speeding. Adding businesses would be good. As it is right now, it is very scary to ride on. 1st option would be great, 2nd is also helpful.

Bevan – I would prioritize whichever option is safer.

Ben - Anything would be an improvement over the current situation on 72nd.

Meesa - I know a lot of cars park on 72nd so there may be pushback by the residents for no parking... it is mostly single family homes and many without driveways.

Scott – I know there would be pushback to removing parking. But need to be as pedestrian forward as possible. We need to prioritize the pedestrian.

Bryan – Likely spillover of parking onto side streets if parking removed from 72nd. Could have a different street configuration approach in the business district.

Pam - I agree with Scott. Advocate for safest option now & in likely future care-free future. Julie – Also agrees with Scott.

Tim – If limited by space, is there a reason to put bikes on 72nd, if there are other parallel bike ways?
Agree that 72nd feels dangerous for people riding bicycles.

Bryan – There is a multi-block gap between 72nd and the 70s greenway. This is an issue along a number of main streets.

Zef - It's pretty challenging to come up with a really close parallel bikeway, such as the way Clinton is close to Division, because the street grid breaks down in multiple locations next to 72nd Ave.

Tim – Is there a specific metric PBOT uses for these bikeway spacing decisions? Zef – PBOT uses a metric of 800 feet between bikeways. 72nd would address a gap. Removing parking also removes opportunities for freight loading, curb extensions, bike parking. Harder to remove parking in an established business district. Likely to be impacts in terms of parking on side streets.

Bevan – Interested in parallel bicycle connections.

Ben – 72nd is the only north-south street that is easy to follow because it doesn't jog every few blocks. The reason it has so much car traffic is also the reason we need bike lanes

Tim - I would imagine that also increases car traffic on 72nd too, since there's no direct different way?

Zef – Yes, that makes sense.

Anna – Understand there are only a few continuous streets for connections. Also concerned about having to inhale fumes from cars. Prefer quieter streets for bicycling. Why do we have to put bicycles on the busy streets if there are alternatives? Are there lower-traffic streets people are already using in the area?

Ben - A Clinton/Division-style parallel bikeway would be great, but I don't see a route that would give us that kind of straightforward route. The more realistic model is Salmon-Taylor, which is really difficult to follow because it shifts every few blocks.

Julie – Concerned about just keeping bikes on secondary streets. Would be nice to be able to ride right up to a business on a main street. Frustrating for cyclists. Are we prioritizing bicycles or cars? Not having direct connections makes me want to drive a car.

Bevan - Looking at the map 72nd appears to be the best option for a north/south bike route.

Tim - I agree Bevan - but sounds like at 40' wide, there are definitely some tradeoffs to consider.

Ben - 72nd is going to be a contentious public input process. Good luck!

Nancy – Please think about the elderly and the need to prioritize transit. Not everyone will be riding a bike and we are going to have a large elderly population that needs to get around.

Alternative street designs for gravel streets

Bryan - Bryan shifted the discussion to ideas for alternative street design approaches for improvements to gravel streets, such as for the Tolman neighborhood greenway. Could keep the pavement narrow with a shared street approach and speeds limited to 15 MPH.

Zef – Errol Heights provides examples. If auto access is not needed, could just improve with 12-foot wide connection, with bollards preventing auto access.

Transit network

Bryan – Shared that TriMet has been looking at system-wide bus route changes, with an initiative called Forward Together, with a prioritization placed on equity. PBOT staff shared ideas from the Lower SE Rising process with TriMet. Forward Together has a lot of alignment with Lower SE Rising concepts. TriMet will release the Forward Together proposals in a couple days. Staff will share links with the PAC.

Zef – Forward Together will have a two month public comment period. Staff will keep looking at the proposals and encourages PAC members and the community to review and comment.

Moving to project prioritization

Bryan – Shared diagrams presenting an approach to prioritizing projects based on a range of prioritization factors. Potential prioritization factors include relationship to the preferred centers and corridors community development scenario, safety benefits, location in Brentwood-Darlington, access to parks and schools and other community destinations, community support, and costs/feasibility.

Bevan – Asked about how project prioritization will take place. Bryan responded that staff will be working on a draft list of Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects, based on PAC and community input.

Bevan – Tolman is critical for connectivity. Would not want it to be left off the list of priority projects because of costs of paving. Zef – We'll need to discuss this more internally. Would tend to divide Tolman into two projects – less expensive segments as one project, and portions requiring paving as a separate project. Maybe this needs to be prioritized even as a paving project.

Wrap Up and Next Steps

Bryan gave a wrap up and went over next steps of the project:

- Staff will make the Draft Preferred Framework Report available to the PAC in October
- Will present the preferred community development scenario and transportation projects to the TAC in October
- Beginning work on the outline of the plan document, which will include draft recommendations for land use changes, displacement mitigation, and transportation improvements.
- Next Committee meeting tentatively scheduled for October 24, 2022. Likely topics include:
 - Update on refined maps/ project list
 - Potential zoning changes
 - Draft list of anti-displacement strategies

The meeting ended at 8:05 pm.