

From: Chris Smith [mailto:chris@chris-smith.us]

Sent: Tuesday, July 05, 2016 3:38 PM

To: Edmunds, Sallie <Sallie.Edmunds@portlandoregon.gov>; Doss, Troy <Troy.Doss@portlandoregon.gov>; Hoy, Rachael <Rachael.Hoy@portlandoregon.gov>

Cc: Zehnder, Joe <Joe.Zehnder@portlandoregon.gov>; Ocken, Julie <Julie.Ocken@portlandoregon.gov>; Leclerc, Mauricio <Mauricio.Leclerc@portlandoregon.gov>; Schultz, Katherine

<Katherine.Schultz@portlandoregon.gov>; Baugh, Andre <Andre.Baugh@portlandoregon.gov>

Subject: [Approved Sender] initial CC2035 comments/questions

Sallie/Troy/Rachael,

I have not completed the CC2035 survey, I don't believe I need any topic-specific briefings. But let me know what gets scheduled and I may sit in on some depending on schedule.

I do have some initial questions/opinions (below) after my first pass through plan, and I'd be interested in your take on these. I'm sure I'll have many more after the hearings.

Thanks.

Chris

Vol2A-A1

p. 229 Preservation Parking specifies one long term bicycle parking space per 14 motor vehicle spaces. This ratio feels out of date, what's the rationale for it? Why isn't this regulated in the bicycle parking code? [Bicycle parking is being looked at comprehensively as part of a citywide effort led by Sarah Figliozzi from PBOT. That effort will lead to bike parking code changes including for the Central City. This policy affecting Preservation Parking may get addressed as part of that effort.](#)

p. 367 Map 510-12 I'm curious about the policy rationale for limiting retail sales and service in those specific areas, and in the Central City in general. I can appreciate that we don't want regional "big box" retail in the Central City, but is there a rationale for "medium box" that is in-between neighborhood retail and big box? I'm thinking about the downtown Target or the Orchard Supply in Hollywood. These seem useful in the Central City or Inner Ring to prevent some auto trips to big box stores or to meet some needs by bike and transit that neighborhood retail can't. Do these fit within the current square foot limits? [The 40,000 sq. ft. limit is intended to be large enough to allow a grocery store \(think Safeway in the Pearl\) or hardware center \(think Orchard in Central Eastside\). However, not so large as to allow a Target or even larger format store that becomes more of a regional attractor.](#)

p. 371 Map 510-13 is labeled as "Proposed Streetcar Alignment" but appears to show the constructed to-date system? We have labeled all the maps as "proposed" since this is the Proposed Draft. You are correct that this is the constructed to-date system.

Vol2-A2

33.475.500 regulates cleanup in the river. Won't EPA regs supersede this? Why are we regulating this? Required clean-up actions do not have to follow local review processes but do have to meet the substantive requirements of local codes. Because the greenway code that we are in the process of updating is a review based code, DEQ did not have any substantive guidance to provide for a clean-up action. So, DEQ asked the City to develop a set of substantive requirements. We created the first draft of these substantive requirements for the River Plan / North Reach and have updated that draft for the CC2035 code in consultation with the City's Superfund attorneys.

The guidance in the code does not regulate how something is cleaned up, only what we want the final land use conditions to be after the clean-up.

Vol2B

p. 7 Transit Classification Map shows portions of NW Raleigh, Overton, 12th and 9th as transit streets. What do we know about potential TriMet plans that drives this? This classification follows TriMet's proposed extension of the Line 10 bus into the north Pearl District and NW District areas, part of their Service Enhancement Plan: <http://trimet.org/future/pdf/north-central-final-map.pdf>

As I mentioned in the briefing, I'm looking forward to better maps to review the bicycle classification: PBOT is digitizing the classifications into GIS to be usable in MapApp. Staff will send in the next few days the Bicycle Street Classifications and the Street Design classifications to BPS to be added to the MapApp as soon as possible. PBOT will send the rest of the classifications to BPS as they are ready. Please note that MapApp only has citywide classifications for bicycles and street design. If you wish, when the bicycle classifications are converted to GIS, we can customize a map for you. Please let us know.

- NE/SE 9th is identified in the RTP and the 2010 Master Plan as a bicycle facility and the SE Quadrant Plan did not specifically call out dropping it, but it appears to have been removed. Why? If 7th is going to be both the Green Loop and a Major City Bikeway how are we going to accommodate both recreational bike/ped traffic and faster 'transportation' bicycle traffic? The freight community in the Central Eastside has expressed strong concerns about the viability and safety of a neighborhood greenway on SE 9th, which experiences high levels of truck loading, and PBOT staff agree that some of these concerns are valid. Furthermore, we believe that the bikeway on SE 7th Ave can be upgraded (and extended north to I-84) in such a way that it would provide a high-quality, safe, and comfortable bikeway for all ages and abilities. The 7th Ave route will also better provide access to the growing number of destinations along Grand/MLK

and more closely parallel the Streetcar route, compared to 9th Ave, which is two additional blocks to the east. We are also proposing bicycle facilities on 11th and 12th Avenues, which we think is feasible based our latest analysis, and something advocated by HAND representatives and many individual commenters. Overall, we think 7th and 11th/12th are more desirable bikeway routes compared to 9th and think they will provide enough north/south mobility for the district.

- I believe NW Overton is shown in the TSP as a bikeway up to the Central City boundary, but it is not shown on the Central City map. While I realize the long-term goal is to move this facility to Pettygrove, until that's done, Overton should retain its classification. We received a high volume of feedback from NW District and Pearl District indicating that people want to see the desired future bikeways (Pettygrove and Savier) rather than the sub-standard existing ones (Overton and Raleigh). Typically the TSP is forward-looking, and we often give streets classifications based on how we want them to be, rather than based on how they currently function. For example, 18th and 19th in NW are classified as Local Service Traffic Streets, even though they currently function as Neighborhood Collectors. This was the thinking behind our proposed classifications. As you note, this would be inconsistent with the TSP Stage 2 Recommended Draft, so we may want to work with City Council to develop an amendment to make them consistent.

- I am very skeptical of the SW 20th bikeway in Goose Hollow. I believe the grades are too steep to be practical/attractive to most cyclists (including the approach from SW Salmon). I would encourage a serious evaluation of SW 18th. The SW 20th route does have grade issues but was identified in the Bicycle Master Plan as a City Bikeway and was asked for by some commenters. We have evaluated SW 18th Ave and have not figured out a way to make it a viable bikeway. When light rail was constructed, it was not built with bike lanes in mind, and there is no space for them between the center light rail and the curbs. Given that this serves a critical traffic function as one of the only through routes connecting Jefferson to Burnside and up to NW via 18th/19th, it is hard to imagine diversion successfully being employed on SW 18th Ave. We have included a future bike route on SW 16th going through the Lincoln High School campus, so perhaps the NW 20th Ave neighborhood greenway could work together with NW 16th to provide north/south access in the district.