Meeting Minutes

Project:	US 26: Outer Powell Transportation Safety Project (OPTSP)
Subject:	Community Advisory Group Meeting #7
Date:	Wednesday, June 15, 2016
Location:	Human Solutions Community Room, 12350 SE Powell Blvd.

Refreshments were served at 5:30 p.m.; meeting started at 6:00 p.m.

1. Introductions – Andy Johnson, project team member, started the meeting with a warm welcome, and lead Community Advisory Group and Project Team introductions. He then provided an overview of the agenda.

   Community Advisory Group attendees:
   - Jean Ky, Powell Plaza retirement community resident
   - Teresa Keishi Soto, East Portland Action Plan (EPAP), and OPAL committee member
   - Tom Barnes, Powellhurst-Gilbert Neighborhood Association Chair
   - Joe Little, property and business owner along Powell Blvd.
   - Dan McCue, David Douglas School District, Communications Director
   - Jennifer Beil, Pastor at St. Timothy Church, Community Advisory Group Co-Chair
   - Kem Marks, Powell resident and EPAP representative
   - Cammy Pierson, Curtis Trailers, property and business owner
   - Cora Potter, Lents Neighborhood Association
   - Elizabeth Quiroz, Bicycle Transportation Alliance
   - Paul Grosjean, Pleasant Valley Neighborhood Association, Community Advisory Group Co-Chair

   Project Team attendees:
   - Mike Mason, ODOT Project Manager
   - Matt Freitag, ODOT Project Manager
   - Shelli Romero, ODOT Interim Area Manager
   - Susan Hanson, ODOT Community Affairs Manager
   - Andy Johnson, HDR Planning Phase Project Manager
   - Mike Bertram, HDR Final Design Phase Project Manager
   - Cassie Davis, HDR Public Involvement Coordinator

   Public/Other attendees:
   - April Bertelsen, Portland Bureau of Transportation

2. Public Comment Period – Andy opened the meeting to any public comments. There were none.

3. Report Back

- Environmental Summary Report (Mike Mason) – In December 2015, the project team completed the environmental reports for the project and submitted them to FHWA for review. The goal for the environmental reporting and review process is for ODOT and FHWA to come to an agreement on whether significant impacts were found. The environmental reports include:

Potential Impacts	Minor / No Impacts
Vegetation	Biology/Wetlands
Visual	Air Quality
Noise	Utilities
Right of Way	Section 4(f)
Water Resources/Quality	Section 6(f)
Socio-Economics/ Environmental Justice	Land Use
Parks and Recreation	Geology
Cultural/Historic	Hazardous Materials

Fifteen reports have been completed and reviewed by FHWA. There are several short-term impacts such as noise and air quality during construction. There are minimal long-term impacts. For example, some trees will be cut down, but there will be additional tree plantings to supplement the removals. Noise will be elevated in some areas. During the design phase, the project team will be preparing a detailed noise analysis to determine if there are any project mitigation needs and then meet with residents who may be impacted to determine whether they want mitigation or not. The only report still pending FHWA approval is the Environmental Justice (EJ) report. FHWA anticipates having the review completed in about a week. The project team has created a shorter document that summarizes the environmental work performed and their findings. The document can be found on the project website's 'Resources' page - http://outerpowellsafety.org/doc/OPTSP_ES_working_2016-06-06_2nd_version.pdf.

  - **Action:** Cassie Davis to send a link to the Environmental Summary to the CAG.
  - Kem Marks asked what some of the comments were related to the EJ report.
    - Mike said that the EJ report comes out of a federal act regarding projects that may have impacts on certain residents out of proportion than others in the corridor. For example, it assesses whether the project would impact low income or minority groups disproportionally than everybody else. For this project, the determination is that there is no evidence that these groups would be more impacted than others.
    - Mike noted that there is one Vietnamese business owner whose business may be impacted by the project and the EJ technical report documents this impact.

- CAG is welcome to contact the project team with any questions regarding the Environmental Reports.

- Funding
  - The project has $20 million earmarked for SE 122nd Ave. to SE 136th Ave – $17 million from the State Legislature and $3 million from the Metro MTIP program.
  - ODOT in conjunction with City of Portland (COP) submitted a TIGER grant application requesting $15.5 million for SE 116th Ave. to SE 162nd Ave. TIGER stands for Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery. ODOT will find out results of their submission in late summer/early fall.
  - The grant preparation process requires applicants to submit at least eight letters of support; the project team received an overwhelming amount of support with 23 letters from groups and individuals in the community including the CAG (see table below). Mike thanked the committee for their support. The grant application along with these letters can be found on the project website.

TTIGER Grant Letters of Support	
Oregon Transportation Commission	OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon
City of Portland Council	Oregon Walks
US Congress	Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon
US Senate	Centennial School District
Oregon House of Representatives	David Douglas School District
ODOT Region 1 Area Commission on	Human Solutions
Portland Metro Council	Rose Community Development
Multnomah County Board of County	Bicycle Transportation Alliance
TriMet	Community Cycling Center
City of Gresham	Portland Pedestrian Advisory Committee
East Portland Action Plan	St. Timothy Lutheran Church
Project Community Advisory Committee (CAG)	Google Fiber
Coalition for America's Gateway and Trade Corridors	

  - April Bertelsen said the COP has submitted a resolution to amend this project with funds from their System Development Charges (SDCs) if the TIGER grant is approved. Theresa and Kem were at this commissioner meeting.
  - Mike shared that a task force of 14 Legislators are travelling around the state visiting different project ideas to help inform future decisions about funding. During their recent visit to Portland, they looked several projects in the area including the Outer Powell Transportation Safety Project. The project team held an event at St. Timothy Church, where Kem and Jennifer offered impassioned talks about why this project was

needed. The Legislators reacted favorably to the event and had positive comments following the meeting.

- Bike Analysis
    - Andy shared that since the last CAG meeting, the project team has been advancing design elements previously presented to the group. Specifically, the buffered bike lane and raised bike lane options where the project team has performed a deeper analysis on two advanced options. The project team has also assessed an additional curbed bike lane treatment that was proposed by PBOT. This concept was proposed late in the planning phase and had not been reviewed or vetted previously.
    - The project team reviewed three main design standards documents as a means of testing the best solution: 1.) Urban Bikeway Design Guide (NACTO), 2.) Portland Bike Design Guide and 3.) National Cycle Manual (Ireland). The project team members additionally reviewed AASHTO and FHWA design guidelines. They also investigated different applications of bike facilities installed by other cities, counties and DOTs. The team then applied this information to the environment, footprint and conditions of Outer Powell. The team highlighted several informative elements of the design guides. For example, curbs should not be used within a certain 'shy distance'. Shy distance is a buffer that should be provided between vehicles and obstructions for safety.
    - The project team also had meetings with several City of Portland Bureaus (PBOT, Water Bureau, and Bureau of Environmental Services). As a group they shared experiences and technical information about the implications of the different bike treatment options. They also looked at Cully Boulevard and Multnomah Boulevard examples where curbs have been installed. This information helped the team further understand the extent of maintenance and drainage challenges.
    - The project team spoke with the City of Hillsboro (COH) which has been implementing raised bike lanes. Hillsboro said that it has had some cracking around stormwater collection grates and that constructability has not been a big issue, but has been more costly. There have been some behavioral issues with people driving into/onto the raised bike lane areas, as well as issues related to trash collection and mail delivery and pick up. The most significant concern Hillsboro staff expressed was their experience with raised bike lanes in predominately residential areas with numerous driveways approaches. Hillsboro has decided to no longer install raised bike facilities in areas with a significant number of driveways.
    - The project team used all the information gathered to evaluate the pros and cons of the study options to determine a holistic solution for the Outer Powell project (see bike cross sections and criteria matrix handouts). The major challenges with the raised and curbed options include the number of curb cuts needed to serve the high number of driveways, maintenance issues and not having proper maintenance equipment. Drainage is also a significant issue – from a collection, constructability, maintenance and user experience standpoints. Since the raised facility would need to drop slightly to allow for water to collect it would cause the bike lane to drop wherever there is an inlet, creating a roller coaster affect. The team looked at adding drain grates in these areas to minimize how often the bike lane elevation would fluctuate. This helped

improve the user experience; however clogged and/or damaged grates pose safety concerns by preventing water from draining and causing water to pool into the roadway.

- From a user experience, the raised facility offers color and texture, which provides traffic calming and offers an attractive benefit to the design. Based on this benefit, the project team decided to evaluate a buffered bike lane option with color and texture components to take advantage of these traffic calming effects. This included concrete pavement, raised profile striping, and turtle-shell-like domes.
- The project team also evaluated the cost of the options (adding grates to the raised option, or color/texture to the buffered, etc.) The estimated cost for each treatment is as follows:
    - Enhanced buffered bike lane with asphalt: $562,000 ($83 per linear foot)
    - Enhanced buffered bike lane with concrete: $808,000 ($118 per linear foot)
    - Raised bike lane with curb cut outs: $1,020,000 ($150 per linear foot)
    - Raised bike lane with grates: $1,190,000 ($175.00)

    **These numbers do not reflect long-term cost of maintenance.*
- Overall, the raised bike lane with curb cuts is considered to have the worst user experience, while the buffered bike lane with a different color/texture and raised element (i.e. thick profile striping, turtle-shell-like rumble strips) is considered to have the best overall experience.
- Kem pointed out that the team is leaning towards a non-raised bike facility. He further expressed that he believed that one of the potential options for a raised bike lane is to use a beveled curb to help level out the ride.
    - Andy clarified that while this is true, the need for adequate drainage would continue to pose an issue because of frequent dips in the facility. The drain grates aim to minimize that affect but not without inherent issues with clogging and maintenance. There are design requirements that limit the amount of water that can pool into the roadway causing the drainage facility to be more complex.
- Kem said in his experience he thinks drivers will still cross into the buffered bike lane even with the raised and visual elements.
    - Shelli Romero noted that one of the reasons that cars go into the bike lane is to get around left-turning vehicles. In the future condition, the project will be adding a center left turn lane which will minimize this condition.
    - Kem said in general he feels people go into the bike lane regardless of the other elements.
- Elizabeth agreed with Kem and said she would like the project team to continue looking at elements to provide protection.
    - Tom and Teresa agreed.
- Tom asked about the use of permeable surfaces to be used in the bike lane and sidewalks to help with drainage.
    - Matt Freitag said as of now, permeable surfaces do not provide the necessary structural strength to be used within the roadway cross section and that

stormwater will drain into the street where it will be collected and treated before it is released into the soil.

- Cora said her experience with at-grade facilities is that cars drift into the bike lane to see ahead of other vehicles. Andy noted that the two-way left turn lane that will be built as part of the project would allow motorists to see ahead rather than crossing the profiled (raised) striping.
- Andy said that the majority of reported bike injuries were at intersections. And reminded the group at the last meeting that the team will be looking into these protected intersection treatments in the design phase.
- Cammy noted that Powell has more automotive traffic than pedestrian and bicycle traffic. She said she feels strongly about looking at wider lanes versus narrowing them to accommodate additional facilities. She further said that this is a project that protects all modes of traffic and there is a lot of freight and trailer traffic along Powell that should be considered. All modes of transportation have to be improved. By reducing the vehicle lanes it makes vehicle transportation more dangerous. She feels wider lanes make people feel more comfortable.
    - Mike said most of the vehicle crashes are rear end and left hand turns, and the center turn lane is considered to be one of the best treatments for reducing these kinds of collisions.
    - Tom agreed with Cammy about widening lanes. He said he has a large truck and feels uncomfortable making certain movements in narrower lanes.
    - Kem said he disagrees with Cammy. He thinks narrower lanes makes people slow down more which reduces collisions. He would have reservations about widening the travel lanes. He also said he would be more optimistic about the bike treatments if the road speeds were reduced to 25 mph. If the bike lanes are not going to be raised, than he thinks the road speed should be reduced.
- Elizabeth asked how the speed could be reduced at the legislative/agency level.
    - Mike said that in considering posted speed reduction that there are several factors that need to be evaluated because in some cases, speed limit studies sometimes recommend that the posted speed be increased.
    - Shelli noted that speed reduction is not an ODOT decision. There is a non-agency specific speed evaluation panel in Salem that makes the decisions on posted speed limits.
    - Mike said that there may be a better opportunity for a speed reduction after project completion when traffic calming elements are built.

4. Design Phase Kickoff – Andy announced that the design phase is now kicking off, which includes new team members and new project activities. Now that the environmental and planning phase is concluding, the project team will move forward with final design. The new ODOT project manager, Matt Freitag and HDR project manager, Mike Bertram will now be leading the team. Andy invited Mike up to introduce himself and give a brief overview of the design phase and timeline.
    - Mike thanked the CAG for all the work they have done to date. In the design phase the project team will first take all the decisions that were made during the planning phase and apply them

to the specific project limit from roughly 122nd to 136th so they can begin communicating with property owners and community members about what can be expected. The team will further evaluate issues such as stormwater, traffic operations, hazardous materials, geotechnical, and infiltration. Geotechnical subsurface investigation soil collection and drilling will be occurring soon to gather information that will inform how the project proceeds. Roadway drainage and all the design treatments moving forward will be assessed to confirm the project footprint. Some driveways may need to be consolidated and/or reduced throughout the corridor. This footprint confirmation stage is documented as part of the Design Acceptance Process (DAP). Following DAP, once the project team understands the impacts, it can begin meeting with property owners and community members to discuss the anticipated impacts. The project team will continue to work toward 60%, 90% and 100% design thereafter. The design phase is anticipated to require 24 months with construction beginning in early 2019.

- Andy reviewed the standard cross section for the project, which includes sidewalks, bike lanes, vehicle lanes and a center turn lane. He also reviewed some of the design elements discussed at the last CAG meeting that will be further investigated during the design phase – intersection treatments, bike/bus wrap-around treatments and bus pull-outs. This is also the time where lighting and signaling will be evaluated and brought into the design.
    - April said she feels the ODOT team did a good job looking at intersections to find ways to improve protection.
- Mike further noted that during construction, access for vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists will be limited and traffic control will assess and consider all modes.
- Mike urged the CAG to reach out anytime with questions about the design process.

5. Public Involvement and Community Advisory Group
    - Cassie shared that the public involvement and community outreach activities will be similar to the planning phase. The project team will continue to have open houses at defined project delivery milestones throughout the project. The CAG will not meet as frequently as during the planning phase. Meetings will occur every 6-9 months between now and the beginning of construction. The CAG is encouraged to share information about the project with their affiliated groups. The project team will continue to engage diverse communities and participate in activities occurring within the community to keep people informed as the project moves forward. More one-on-one discussions with property and business owners will take place as the team understands specific construction elements and how they may impact certain groups and individuals. The project will continue to offer translation services and have resources available online.

6. Final Thoughts
    - Shelli addressed the CAG and stressed the need to move forward with the bike lane decision. Input was received at the last round of committee meetings and the team performed further analysis on both the raised and buffered options. The raised option revealed several concerns related to drainage, maintenance, inconsistency and other variables. As a result, ODOT is proceeding with the buffered bike lane option. The enhanced buffered bike lane option is the option that HDR and Toole have recommended for this project and is the option ODOT has

directed the consultant to move forward with designing. The surface treatment and buffer delineation requirements are to be determined. ODOT will work with the City, TriMet and other partners and stakeholders to identify suitable bike buffer treatments. Shelli further expressed that this is a critical time for the project to move forward and not be delayed. They have commitments to Representative Fagan, other legislators who backed project funding, and the broader community to see this project through and if it doesn't continue to move forward now it can threaten the project and timeline. ODOT needs to provide the consultant design team with a decision on the bike lane treatment now so they have enough time to design and keep the project on schedule which includes a 2019 construction year. She thanked the committee for all their work and support in getting the project to this point.

Meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.