



BIKE LOUD PDX

BIKELOUDPDX@GMAIL.COM

@BIKELOUDPDX

FACEBOOK.COM/BIKELOUD

September 18, 2018

To: Gabe Graff

cc: Scott Cohen
PBOT Interim Director Chris Warner
Commissioner Chloe Eudaly

Introduction

We are strongly in support of the stated goals of the CCIM: prioritizing safety, promoting equity, enabling efficiency, and improving sustainability. The Central City, and especially downtown, have long suffered gaps in our active transportation network, and we are anxiously anticipating implementation of the priorities and projects outlined in the Central City 2035 Plan.

For this document, we will try something different and forgo “bike lane,” “cycling,” “people on bikes,” etc. in favor of “LIT.” LIT, an acronym for either “light individual transport” or “low-impact transport,” encompasses not only bicycles but also trikes and bicycle-like mobility devices, as well as scooters, skateboards, etc. We are no longer designing and constructing bike facilities just for bikes.

Design, Rollout, and Other General Considerations

Designing world-class facilities:

While some of the 18 possible CCIM projects have a clear design, others are still up in the air. It makes us a little uneasy being asked to choose and support projects without knowing what their final design will be, as small details can make or (more likely) hobble a LIT facility. So when it comes to CCIM projects (or any project, really) we expect the following:

- All Ages and Abilities (AAA)-quality designs that appeal to even the most concerned of the “interested but concerned” cohort
- A gapless network that does not drop off or throw LIT users into inferior or non-existent infrastructure

- Facilities that are as direct and intuitive as those for automotive users (where the route itself is not intuitive, e.g. branches from the main arterial street or requires leaving the line of sight, generous amounts of wayfinding are needed)
- Facilities that do not put transit and LIT users at odds (e.g. encouraging LIT users and buses to “frog hop” each other)
- Using diversion, chicanes, placemaking, and other traffic-calming measures first, and implementation of speed bumps only as an absolute last resort on LIT facilities
- Protected facilities to extend into crossings via protected intersections
- Properly daylighted intersections, driveways, etc, so that LIT users (who already are nearly invisible according to the number of “I didn’t see them” crashes), and people on foot and in vehicles too, can see and be seen by other road users at conflict zones (this means following ORS 811.550 and prohibiting auto parking within 20’ of a crosswalk; bike, scooter, and even motorcycle parking would be acceptable, however, due to their significantly shorter and less boxy stature)
- Prioritization of movement for LIT, pedestrian, and/or transit movement on their respective priority-designated streets (this includes changing signal length or timing, addition of bike/transit signals, leading bike/ped intervals, flipped stop signs/directional priority, implementation of scramble intersections, etc; downtown’s “green wave” is a good example of this in practice)
- Gentle bends, curves, and bumps
- A generally safety-first design (e.g. banning turns on red, reducing speed limits, etc)

There are many other additional features and touches that can greatly enhance the experience and appeal of LIT facilities, such as using different materials or colors to differentiate the facility from the roadway and sidewalk, aesthetically-pleasing materials such as statues and maintained planter boxes, and various placemaking techniques. However these are more expensive, and their use should be prioritized in high-profile areas and on signature projects, or in places of high conflict.

Capacity concerns:

Another design issue that gave us pause on a number of proposed projects is that of capacity. One of the major appeals of LIT over automotive use, especially at rush hour, is that no matter the time of day you can expect your trip to take about the same amount of time. Lots of people choose to travel during peak hours by LIT because it’s faster than going by car, or at least you’re constantly moving instead of dealing with lots of stops and gos. Removing this perk of LIT travel reduces its appeal.

As LIT modes are pretty space-efficient, congestion manifests itself differently than with automobiles. A congested LIT route is one where faster users are unable to comfortably pass slower users, and where users find themselves unable to pass through a signalized intersection that they otherwise would have cleared if there were fewer LIT users on the facility. An existing

example of this is SE Hawthorne east of the Grand signal, where you can witness a lot of passing behavior (some of it aggressive and/or unsafe) along the downhill door-zone bike lane that's too narrow to actually accommodate passing. Much of the motivation for faster riders to blow past slower riders is the signals: SE 7th and 12th are timed in such a way that slower riders, and faster riders who were not at the front of the pack when the signal at Grand turned green, are likely to get stuck at these signals.

There are two solutions to this problem: wider facilities that can accommodate passing, allowing fast LIT users to keep up with traffic and signal timing, and "green wave" signal timing that slows everyone down to the pace of the average user. Both techniques have their merits. On uphill slopes, passing lanes are incredibly important, as some users will intentionally slow to a crawl to reduce physical strain, while others will want to continue with their previous pace. The speed difference between users becomes especially pronounced between modes (e.g. an electric-assist bike vs a kick scooter) and user types (e.g. an unsure rider vs an experienced one, or someone leisurely riding to the library vs someone racing the clock to get across town for a meeting). So creating facilities for all LIT devices, and for All Ages and Abilities, requires wide uphill lanes.

On flatter ground, where the speed difference between users is less pronounced, or along high-crash corridors, the green wave approach may be preferred. By adjusting signal timing to an average speed closer to 10-15 mph, all road users travel at about the same speed. However, traveling at this slower speed might be jarring to some road users (especially if signage indicates a much higher official speed limit), and in areas where traffic lights are not as dense (such as the Central Eastside) many users might not even notice the green wave and will continue to travel at their preferred fast pace. Other cities, such as San Francisco and Montreal, post signage indicating the green wave timing speed, and we would encourage trying that here.

The key difference between passing lanes vs signal timing is culture change. Providing passing lanes for faster riders accommodates the desires of many current LIT users, who are more used to traveling at prevailing auto speeds, and protects slower riders from being passed aggressively or feeling uncomfortable that they're "holding up the line." Adjusting signals to slow everyone down, however, requires seasoned riders (and drivers) to adjust their riding/driving styles as well as their expectations on how long their trip will take. This culture change may be a worthy long-term goal, however it requires both time and uniformity, and in a city where most trips by most LIT users involve sharing the roadway with autos, it will be hard to break the speedster attitude that not only makes active transportation a comparable option to driving, but also protects LIT users from dangerous situations like impatient, road raging drivers. Until then, on facilities that are highly trafficked by a wide variety of user types, or with hills, tightly timed signals, and other features likely to elicit large speed differences among LIT users, passing lanes are probably better.

On the topic of width, it's not just about passing. Traditionally, our transportation network has been built (and evaluated) according to the needs of commute traffic. LIT users are similar to

automotive commuters in that most commute trips are taken solo. But non-commute LIT trips are frequently taken in groups (various studies have found this is particularly likely among people of color). For both social and safety reasons, side-by-side riding should be incorporated into the design of any facility that can accommodate it, especially on facilities that are anticipated to be popular family, tourist, and recreational routes.

Another capacity concern is future growth. It would be wonderful if CCIM proved wildly successful and suddenly a third of all road users on SW 4th were LIT users (given the citywide goal of 20-25% of all trips to be on bike, this is far from unlikely). Unfortunately, given the current proposal for the street, 80% of the roadway would still be dedicated to the storage or movement of motor vehicles. There are two problems: one is that while LIT are significantly more space-efficient, they're not two-dimensional; much like how at popular turns motor vehicles require a left- or right-turn lane, we could start to see substantial LIT congestion overflowing from bike boxes at popular Copenhagen left/right-turns. This creates mobility and safety issues; LIT users trying to bypass turning individuals could get stuck and be unable to continue straight, and LIT users overflowing from the bike box into the auto lanes risk getting struck by an inattentive or careless driver. The second problem, of course, is that if we're trying to incentivize active transportation and disincentivize SOV use, it makes no sense to provide passing auto lanes and plentiful parking. The carrot and stick model breaks down once the carrot grows mold (LIT facilities become too congested to use comfortably) and the stick loses its snap (automotive infrastructure is plentiful). While incremental change may be necessary for political reasons, we do not want to "cement" current mode share by building narrow, low-capacity LIT facilities that cannot accommodate massive growth, while maintaining wide, overbuilt automotive facilities that mask just how inefficient the automobile is given restricted road space.

Temporary vs permanent materials:

One intriguing element of CCIM that was generally neglected (so as to not overwhelm the public, we've heard) in the open houses is that of material type and cost. In our communications with the CCIM team, we've heard that the estimated costs given in the open house are on the conservative side, and could be reduced based on design, cost of materials, and whether the projects can be done easily in-house or need to be contracted out. Temporary materials have many weaknesses: specifically, that they're weak. Plastic wands like those on Better Naito and movable cement planters like those on Multnomah get a lot of abuse and break easily, creating a recurring maintenance cost problem, a failure of aesthetics, and most importantly a safety issue for not-so-protected LIT users in a supposedly protected facility. However not all temporary materials break when encountered by a texting driver or careless snowplow; more robust alternatives are available, such as plastic jersey barriers or drums that can be filled with water or sand. Temporary materials have significant upsides too: in addition to being cheaper, they are forgiving of mistakes and allow projects to experiment and evolve. Projects can be changed as circumstances change, and can grow or shrink with demand (which gets at the capacity issue mentioned above).

Permanent projects, however, create a both perceived and real sense of stability. Drivers are less likely to treat diversion and other intentional impediments as suggestions rather than commands, and interested-but-concerned LIT users are more likely to use facilities that resemble the parks and sidewalks they're already comfortable using over ones that more resemble work zone detours. Induced demand proves the validity of "build it and they will come," and the more you build it, the more they will come; signature projects like the Eastbank Esplanade or Tilikum Bridge will attract people in ways solid-but-generally-unremarkable facilities like the greenway network won't. Most importantly of all, perhaps, is that a shift in political winds might lead to a temporary facility getting reverted by an anti-active transportation city councilor, but it would take a complete vendetta to remove a permanent facility.

BikeLoud recommends that the city balance quality and scale by choosing one or two highly visible projects from the 18 candidate projects as "signature" infrastructure, demonstrating top-quality permanent protected LIT facilities for all to see. This will maximize the citywide impact of CCIM by leading to greater public understanding of top-quality LIT facilities. For the remaining projects, BikeLoud urges the city to consider the examples of Chicago and Austin, which have created IDIQ (indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity) contracts with engineering and construction firms and used modular, flexible standardized separation materials such as molded plastic and precast concrete. This has let them rapidly design and install projects of various scales without a slow, costly and unpredictable bid cycle for each. Such a process could potentially let Portland cut the ribbon on several major downtown network improvements simultaneously, demonstrating the immediate payoff of an improved LIT network. Looking forward, a newly established IDIQ system could potentially create the template for a quick-build process that could be used for relatively rapid LIT infrastructure installation elsewhere in the city. In other words, make one or two of the projects very nice, and do as many of the rest quickly and cheaply as the budget permits. If the signature projects are sufficiently visible, we get the propaganda benefits; if the network improvements elsewhere are sufficiently cheap, we get the ridership benefits of a significant network improvement.

Through this method, we also get to keep the window open for easy future improvements on projects with more questionable initial designs, instead of risking time and money on permanent materials from day one. One thing to avoid, however, is the state of eternal limbo that some "temporary" projects have found themselves in (such as NE Multnomah), where the temporary infrastructure never gets updated. A way to avoid this is on projects where the concern is less about cost and more about insufficient design, set aside the funds necessary to complete the project using permanent materials, designate an "experiment window" during which the temporary materials will remain up, and then revisit the design and implement an improved permanent design (this is mostly recommended for projects where political pressures make implementing a solid design now difficult, and demand needs to be demonstrated before automotive capacity can be converted to LIT capacity, or for projects like Naito where the impact of new technologies like e-scooters are not yet fully understood).

Rollout timing:

Ideally, CCIM projects would be rolled out as networks, rather than piecemeal. This could work well for the projects constructed with temporary materials (which take less time to implement), but may actually be most important for the signature projects. Much like how the Tilikum had a grand opening, nothing says the new signature LIT infrastructure couldn't have a grand unveiling of its own. In that case, you would want the rest of the network to be built out to some degree as well; it would be a wasted opportunity (and give the wrong impression about protected infrastructure) if a world-class facility were built in isolation on SW Broadway, with no low-stress way to access it (remember how the Oregonian boldly declared the Eastbank Esplanade a boondoggle until the connection to the Steel Bridge was completed, resulting in a 180 from the publication). A system-wide rollout could also help ease all road users into any necessary cultural shifts; when Sweden switched from driving on the left to driving on the right they didn't go street-by-street; everything was a work zone and then everything was the new system. Similarly, by constructing all the chosen projects in a region (Downtown/Pearl, Lloyd, Central Eastside) at once, the shock of suddenly seeing a change on one road will be lessened, and area-wide improvements like green wave signal changes or a sudden crop of "no turn on red" signs will experience higher compliance. There is also something to be said for making a "land grab" early, essentially planting a flag for active transportation with temporary materials in the first year or two, so that political changes, funding shifts, or other unexpected events do not prevent planned projects from seeing the light of day. Active transportation projects prompt a lot of fear from the public during the planning process, but usually receive general support once they're up and running.

The 18 Projects

What follows is our assessment of each of the 18 projects. While BikeLoud has come to wear many hats in our advocacy beyond just cycling issues, we decided to stick with our roots and judged each project based on its cycling/LIT elements, followed by its pedestrian elements, followed by general traffic safety, and lastly its transit elements. Due to the natural overlaps in active transportation, we are extremely supportive of projects that improve walking and transit, however there are other groups specific to those issues, so we determined our role here to be that of analysing the cycling elements first and foremost.

We judged each project based on a variety of factors, including: how critical the route is in our transportation network, how the route interacts with other projects (existing or proposed), the number of current users (current demand) and potential users (future demand), whether there is currently LIT infrastructure on the route (and if so, its quality), current safety issues on the route, the quality of the proposed design, estimated cost, and how each project compared with parallel projects in the geographic vicinity. Ranking them proved extremely difficult, as we found projects would often rank very high in a category such as "critical to the network" or "desperately in need of safety improvements" but then have a problematic (or inexplicably expensive) design. It was

also difficult to weigh improving existing but sub-par infrastructure (e.g. SE 7th Ave) over adding infrastructure to a route that currently has none (e.g. SE 11th/12th). But the truly complicating factors were those of cost and type of implementation: only a few projects rose to the top as “absolute must-builds” for the given price tag, and only a few sank to the bottom as “would be nice, but aren’t desperately needed” projects. This left a large swath of “very important, but not critical” (or “critical but with a major flaw”) projects that we couldn’t bring ourselves to rank. The solution was to recommend these be built, but for much cheaper than the listed cost, hopefully increasing the number of projects that could make the final cut in some form or another. Some projects with major flaws we indicate conditional support, where we would like to see them built but only with a specific design (barring that, building them for much cheaper than is proposed).

If you are still unclear on our stance for any given project, please do not hesitate to reach out, so we can attempt to clarify our position.

① Burnside – W 10th to E 12th -- \$5,300,000

The good: Burnside is one of the major spines of the city, and despite poor existing conditions, the Burnside Bridge is a popular LIT route for crossing the Willamette. There are also many various destinations on or near Burnside for both visitors and residents alike, and as such is a highly desirable route for bike facilities. As a high-crash corridor, Burnside is also a major safety priority street when it comes to active transportation.

The bad: From a LIT perspective, the proposed design is extremely disappointing. Expanding the LIT lanes on the west side to 4th is a major improvement, but they would need to extend through the full north-south couplet to Broadway to be properly useful (Broadway/4th is a high priority for us and many others, and we’re operating under the assumption that it will make the final cut). We are also concerned about bus/LIT interactions at bus stops, as it does not appear there will be sufficient room for bus islands. Any new LIT project that involves frog-hopping buses--especially on a route where buses are commonly present--is not acceptable. On that note, E Burnside is even more disappointing, as it appears there will be no improvement over the status quo. This seems like an incredibly wasted opportunity.

Conclusion: We really want to support this project, as it is a critical corridor in Portland’s transportation network, is a high-crash corridor, and is already highly used--albeit reluctantly--due to its convenience and high destination density (and thus would see tremendous LIT growth given a major upgrade). However we find the proposed design extremely underwhelming, especially given the hefty price tag. We do recognize that this project would provide a sorely-needed improvement for transit, and even incremental improvements to the bridge and bridgeheads would greatly boost the number of LIT users using it, furthering the pressure for an active transportation-friendly design when it comes time to rebuild the bridge. Thus we think that (barring a major redesign that better incorporates the safety, convenience, and comfort needs of LIT users) this project should make the final list, but implemented as

cheaply as possible (paint and signs), with the intention of further expansion and improvement (including physical protection) once PBOT has the political will to do so.

② NW/SW Broadway / 4th -- \$6,620,000

The good: This couplet cuts through the heart of downtown, and would provide a direct route to/from PSU all the way to the Broadway Bridge and beyond. We like the protected design, and think it will connect well with the new Flanders greenway and Northwest in Motion. It represents a major improvement over existing conditions on Broadway, and would provide new facilities on highly-desirable 4th.

The bad: Broadway and 4th are three blocks apart, which is unusual for a couplet, and may lead to confusion; plentiful wayfinding and solid east-west routes to connect the two will be important (e.g. large and clear signage directing users from 4th to the Broadway Bridge). We anticipate that these routes will quickly be embraced by a variety of LIT users, and we are worried about capacity issues (particularly on the steep uphill/downhill portions), and negative interactions between seasoned bike commuters who are used to bombing down the hills and tourists and new riders who will be traveling more slowly and cautiously. Bike turning boxes at popular turns (e.g. the Hawthorne Bridge) will need to be large, and will likely warrant some form of physical protection beyond the usual paint. Several stretches of Broadway in particular see a lot of loading/unloading of both passengers and goods, and robust physical protection is a must. We recommend looking into delivery islands at select locations similar to bus islands, where trucks and ride-share services can drop off and pick up people and deliveries without trespassing into the bike lane. The left-hand side bike lane on 4th also creates significant risk of hook-crashes, particularly as a low-visibility parking-protected lane, as many drivers do not think to check for LIT users on their left before turning, making a strong argument for protected intersections. The contraflow lane on Broadway would certainly be a helpful connection to the bridge, but the idea of an unprotected contraflow lane (as indicated in the open house diagram) on a high-traffic street is terrifying. This lane would need substantial physical protection, and likely protected intersections as well.

Conclusion:

Broadway/4th is one of our top-priority CCIM projects, and we would be extremely disappointed if it did not make the final cut. We have some concerns about capacity and safety issues, but feel it is a critical corridor in the LIT network and would be extremely well-used. This would be a good candidate for a “signature” project, something that could be fully built out to world-class standards, and used as a shining example both locally and nationally for the potential of LIT infrastructure in a downtown environment.

③ NE/SE MLK / Grand / 6th / 7th -- \$8,530,000

The good: A highly ambitious endeavor, this project has a little something for everyone. We strongly support the proposal for solid LIT infrastructure that will connect NE all the way to the Tilikum and everything in-between, especially given the forthcoming Sullivan's Crossing. Despite being one block from signalized crossings on Grand or 7th, 6th is a popular route for people on foot due to its low-stress environment, many destinations, and bus stops, and the proposed crossing improvements are sorely needed. The existing bike facilities on 7th are high-stress and grossly underused as a result. MLK/Grand are preposterously overbuilt streets for the heart of a city, especially given the density of otherwise walkable destinations and growth in the area, and even the proposed three lanes of automotive traffic is way too much. The Central Eastside Access and Circulation Improvements project will help tame the couplet, and this project will be a good follow-up.

The bad: This project is the most expensive of the 18, and given its ambition this isn't surprising, however we want to ensure there's good bang-for-our-buck in this project, and much of that will boil down to the details. Regarding the BAT lane, what kind of enforcement will ensure it's actually followed? If freight is also allowed to use the lane, will there be a specific licensing program (perhaps one that, similar to paid parking, could not only fund itself but also provide extra money to put toward district transportation improvements), or can anyone with a pickup truck claim that they're "freight" and use the lane consequence-free? Especially if freight is allowed to use this lane, the couplet will not feel traffic calmed, and will continue to operate as a dangerous and overall unpleasant facility, detracting from what could be a very popular and people-oriented commercial and residential district. Regarding the 6th Ave crossing improvements, assuming the Green Loop will in fact follow this route, crossings will have to be 100% dummy-proof to accommodate the type of family-friendly, safe, and comfortable facility being pitched. Investment in sub-par crossing improvements that would need to be ripped out and replaced with something more solid (like a full signal) later would be wasteful. Similarly, regarding the 7th Ave LIT facility, crossings are a big deal and major intersections would need to be full signals, likely even including bike signals and phases (especially at the awkward diagonal intersection with Sandy). 7th Ave has the potential to be the primary north-south spine in the eastside LIT network, and we're concerned that the current design may not feature enough capacity, specifically the stretch between Clay and Sandy.

Conclusion: We are very supportive of the project aims of improving the 7th Ave bikeway, crossings on 6th, and transit movement on Grand/MLK, however are concerned that the project design may not be sufficient for achieving these goals in a cost-efficient and effective manner. We are cautiously supporting this project for the final cut, trusting that our concerns about project details and the high price tag can be resolved as the project design is finalized.

④ NE/SE 11th / 12th -- \$7,800,000

The good: A lot of us were really excited by the idea of being able to safely and comfortably use LIT on SE 11th/12th, as it's a direct route that hits up a lot of destinations, and doesn't feel as

slow, winding, and hilly as parallel routes SE 16th or the 20s Bikeway. The real gem of this project, however, is the traffic-calming effect it would have on the streets, making crossing the couplet via any mode a breeze compared to now, thus automatically enhancing the Ankeny, Salmon, and Harrison greenways (and improving connectivity with the Clinton greenway). While the #70 bus isn't frequent service, there's hope that it will get upgraded as the Central Eastside grows, making the bus islands in the proposed design a good consideration.

The bad: We were shocked to see this project come in with the second-highest price tag, especially since the LIT lane would not be protected. We can only assume the cost comes from constructing bus islands, and while we're all for eliminating bus/LIT interaction, they all but seal this project's fate as not making the final cut simply for being too expensive. The lack of protection for the LIT lane was really disappointing, and means it would be far from an AAA facility. We were hoping we wouldn't have to choose between 7th and 11th/12th, because while the routes are close, they serve different purposes: 7th connects better to the north while 11th/12th connect better to the south, 7th covers the MLK/Grand/6th/7th/8th commercial corridor while 11th/12th cover the 10th/11th/12th/13th corridor, and 7th is generally more attractive for trips starting or ending in N or Inner NE neighborhoods while 11th/12th are generally more attractive for trips starting or ending in Inner SE. 11th/12th are also more tree-lined and have less of an industrial concrete jungle vibe, which many people find attractive.

Conclusion: Given a strict choice between SE 7th vs 11th/12th, we would begrudgingly choose 7th to make the final cut. However we would strongly recommend looking at the price estimate again and recalculating the cost using the cheapest possible treatment (paint and signage). As this project is not proposed to be AAA anyway, we would rather see a simple restriping project to convert the rightmost travel lane to a LIT lane with minimal other treatments (even forgoing the bus islands) in the short term, with the intention of implementing a proper protected lane with bus islands in the future when funds and political will (and more progressive fire bureau policies) become available, or the #70 officially gets an upgrade to frequent service, than to not include 11th/12th in the CCIM at all. If nothing else a basic lane reallocation with minimal additional treatments would alleviate many of the existing issues with crossing the couplet, and provide substantial pedestrian safety and general comfort enhancements, even without otherwise changing any of the crossings. (Given the reckless driving incident on Hawthorne that resulted in the tragic death of Fallon Smart, occasional concrete planters, jersey barriers, or similar may be necessary to prevent the LIT lane from becoming a passing lane; as recent greenway enhancement projects have demonstrated, these barricades can be procured cheaply.)

⑤ SW Jefferson / Columbia / Madison -- \$3,000,000

The good: The project will provide a smooth connection between the Hawthorne Bridge (and the forthcoming Naito Pkwy project) and Goose Hollow, the MAX, PSU, and a variety of other

popular destinations. The existing bike facilities are less than ideal, and frequently suffer from bus/LIT interactions and incursions from freight vehicles, rideshare, and other automobiles.

The bad: The lack of protection is sorely disappointing, especially given the number of misbehaving drivers we already witness intruding into the existing bike lane. Left-hand bike lanes are also prone to dangerous left-hook behavior from drivers not expecting LIT users on to their left. Even more disappointing is the proposal for SW Madison; with the new facilities on SW 4th, we expect even greater numbers using Madison to access the Hawthorne Bridge, barring major improvement to the narrow and steep Naito onramp. Much like with SE Madison, this is the preferred route for many LIT users to access the bridge on account of its directness and easily-visible location, and again like SE Madison the high number of buses and autos on the street make for a desperate need for dedicated, protected facilities. We had hoped that the inevitable move toward dedicating the outermost lane of the bridge to transit would have taken hold--at least as a trial--prior to the CCIM, which would provide sufficient real estate on both SE and SW Madison for wide protected bike lanes, bus lanes, and bus islands, and it is quite unfortunate that this did not materialize in time for CCIM.

Conclusion: Either SW Jefferson/Columbia or SW Salmon/Taylor need to make the final cut to serve as an east-west connection through downtown and into Goose Hollow. It would be nice to have both; while only ¼ mile apart there were very strong opinions among BikeLoud members as to which to choose, highlighting their differing roles in the transportation network. During a straw-poll vote, the group was evenly split in response to whether we should choose Jefferson/Columbia over Salmon/Taylor or vice-versa. Regardless of which is chosen, there is a strong desire for an AAA protected LIT facility on Madison leading to the Hawthorne Bridge, which we feel should be implemented regardless of whether Jefferson/Columbia or Salmon/Taylor makes the final cut. The Hawthorne Bridge is the premier Willamette crossing for LIT users; whichever project is chosen, extremely intuitive connectivity to and from the Hawthorne Bridge is a must.

⑥ NW/SW 12th / 14th / 17th -- \$3,030,000

The good: With Naito/1st/2nd/3rd serving eastern Downtown/Old Town, and 4th/Broadway serving central Downtown/Old Town, it makes sense to have LIT facilities on the western edge as well. Existing facilities on 14th are lacking. SW 12th is an overbuilt road, and this project would help traffic-calm it.

The bad: We were puzzled by this cluster of projects, which appear to have little in common except for general geographic proximity, and questioned what role they would play in creating a complete LIT network, rather than a smattering of unconnected facilities. We might have looked upon the project more favorably in the context of the nascent Northwest in Motion project, however without that context 12th/14th/17th didn't strike us as very compelling, especially as facilities already exist at least on 14th, albeit unsatisfactory ones, and it seems that this proposal

wouldn't even upgrade them to protected lanes. At least one member also thinks 10th/11th would be preferable routes, at least through the Pearl.

Conclusion: This project was not as popular as Broadway/4th, but members acknowledged the need to improve existing facilities and add facilities where there currently are none. We ranked this as a project we would like to see implemented if possible, perhaps via cheap and temporary means to squeeze it into the CCIM budget (particularly on SW 12th to get something on the ground), however did not consider it a critical project compared to many others in the running.

⑦ NW Everett to Steel Bridge -- \$4,260,000

As an exclusively transit-related project, we will abstain from commenting on it.

⑧ SW Salmon / Taylor -- \$3,770,000

The good: The project will provide a smooth connection between the Hawthorne Bridge (and the popular Salmon Street Fountain), Goose Hollow, the downtown shopping district, and a variety of other popular destinations. Some feel the Hawthorne Bridge connection via 1st will provide a highly intuitive route for those exiting the bridge into downtown (while others feel the Jefferson/Columbia route via 1st/Naito would be more natural). The curbside protected lane has the potential to be an AAA facility, and removes any bus/bike interaction issues. Currently there are no LIT facilities between Stark and Jefferson, and this couplet would fill that gap nicely.

The bad: Salmon/Taylor won't provide as easy access to PSU and other destinations to the south as the Jefferson/Columbia couplet. There are concerns about left-hooks on the route, as there won't be enough space for a protected intersection. There are also concerns about capacity, especially as the route is hilly and we anticipate there may be conflict between faster and slower riders, however given that there are currently not LIT facilities on this couplet, there might not be the expectation issue from a large number of long-time commuters of being able to go fast on this route. This project also does not include SW Madison improvements, which were highly popular, and several members lamented that SW Main was never offered as an option at all.

Conclusion: Either SW Jefferson/Columbia or SW Salmon/Taylor need to make the final cut to serve as an east-west connection through downtown and into Goose Hollow. It would be nice to have both; while only ¼ mile apart there were very strong opinions among BikeLoud members as to which to choose, highlighting their differing roles in the transportation network. During a straw-poll vote, the group was evenly split in response to whether we should choose Jefferson/Columbia over Salmon/Taylor or vice-versa. Regardless of which is chosen, there is a strong desire for an AAA protected LIT facility on Madison leading to the Hawthorne Bridge, which we feel should be implemented regardless of whether Jefferson/Columbia or Salmon/Taylor makes the final cut. The Hawthorne Bridge is the premier Willamette crossing for

LIT users; whichever project is chosen, extremely intuitive connectivity to and from the Hawthorne Bridge is a must.

⑨ SE Salmon -- \$600,000

The good: SE Salmon provides some of the only access to the Eastbank Esplanade, and this greenway would provide a (mostly) direct connection from the waterfront all the way to Mt Tabor, as well as a low-stress east-west connection through the Central Eastside. We like the diverter proposal. Currently the worst part of SE Salmon are the crossings at Water, MLK, Grand, 7th, 11th, and 12th, and having those fixed would create a solid industrial greenway.

The bad: The crossings at MLK/Grand are already being addressed through the Central Eastside Access and Circulation Improvements project. The intersection with 7th is being addressed through the MLK/Grand/6th/7th project (which we assume will make the final cut, at least the bikeway portion on 7th). That leaves just Water and 11th/12th (and as mentioned under the latter, we're hoping a cheap, bare-bones lane reallocation on 11th/12th can be implemented, which would address those two intersections). The diverter at 7th is nice (we would never turn down diversion!) however we're not sure how crucial it is given existing conditions; it is possible that following signal implementation more automobiles would use the route, thus necessitating diversion, but users have not identified high auto volumes nor speeds as problematic on the street today.

Conclusion: While the cheapest project of the bunch, we wonder if the price tag isn't a bit high, considering that most of the intersection improvements are occurring as part of other projects. We would like very much to see improvements on SE Salmon, however we don't feel it should edge out other projects. This is another project we would like to see implemented as cheaply as possible, even merely by putting sharrows down and fixing wayfinding to no longer reroute onto Taylor, but that should be done as soon as the signals at MLK/Grand are installed, regardless of whether Salmon is part of CCIM.

⑩ SW Alder / Washington -- \$1,400,000

The good: The Morrison Bridge LIT facilities are quite underused, partially because of poor access especially on the west side. The "no ped crossing" signs at the bridgehead are also antithetical to the Central City 2035 direction of having downtown be a pedestrian district, and we support changes that would facilitate their removal. We generally like the protected two-way cycle track design.

The bad: The cycle track only extends to SW 4th, and not all the way through the couplet to Broadway, limiting the track's usefulness to primarily northbound movement. There is concern that the LIT lane may not be wide enough, especially for two-way movement, and two-way cycle

tracks open up possibilities for hooks from drivers not expecting contraflow traffic. We are also wary of SW Alder east of 1st, which crosses over the LIT lane, and may create conflict, especially from vehicles turning right from 1st. Some members also wonder about how impactful the project will actually be; given the unfortunately sketchy state of the eastern end of the Morrison Bridge some potential users may feel unsafe and not use the facility, meaning the funds might be better used on other projects.

Conclusion: Bridges and bridgeheads are stated priorities of BikeLoud, and we would like to see this project implemented soon if possible. However we did not identify it as being as high priority as some other projects, so it is another good candidate for a cheap and temporary treatment with the hope of beefing it up in the future with more robust materials when funds become available (and perhaps by then the route will be popular enough to justify its expansion to Broadway, if not beyond).

⑪ SE Belmont / Morrison -- \$3,020,000

The good: This couplet is the best connection to/from the Morrison Bridge, and also passes by many popular commercial destinations. The area is also undergoing a lot of growth and will see many new residents who will benefit from the facility. The overbuilt streets are difficult to cross at unsignalized intersections, and this project will help traffic calm them a bit. We like the protected LIT lanes, which have the potential to be AAA facilities, and the resulting reduction in bus/LIT interactions.

The bad: Why is this project so expensive? The Morrison section is already built, and is functioning fairly well for a less robust facility; the exception to this is the Grand intersection, which users find confusing and conflict-prone. There are some capacity concerns, depending on how the LIT facilities are constructed. Many users may also not want to use the facility west of Grand, as the route tends to be dirty, dark, and somewhat sketchy.

Conclusion: Not as critical an east-west route as Burnside/Couch or Hawthorne/Madison, but still an important route. Given the success so far with the temporary-style Morrison improvements, this would be a good candidate for cheap and temporary facilities until funds for a more robust rebuild can be found. This may also provide an opportunity to widen the facility in the future if it becomes popular.

⑫ SE Hawthorne / Clay / Madison -- \$3,810,000

The good: This dual-couplet (triplet?) is already a well-used and critical route in the LIT network despite its sub-par infrastructure, and is frequently identified as a route that needs upgrades for safety and comfort of LIT users. We like that the project would add protection to the Hawthorne and Clay portions and alleviate bus/LIT interaction. The crossing improvements on Hawthorne

are sorely needed (although less so on Madison, and significantly less so on Clay, especially following the proposed treatments).

The bad: We are concerned that the proposed designs will not accommodate even current LIT users (never mind growth) especially on Hawthorne, but also on Clay in the AM peak. Both routes are sloped, which results in a lot of passing of slower riders, especially near the Grand and 7th Ave lights. Current light timing can make it difficult to pass through these signals on LIT without getting stopped at each, especially on heavier devices such as Biketown, and a green wave implementation may alleviate some of the more aggressive passing maneuvers seen today. There was also some disappointment at the loss of eastbound bike movement on Clay, leaving an awkward five-block gap between Clay and the start of the Ladd Greenway at 12th. This may be inevitable given the bioswales, however the former eastbound Clay LIT users will add to Hawthorne LIT lane traffic, only further emphasizing the need for higher LIT capacity. There was a request that the current preferred commuter route from Ladd Greenway to the Hawthorne Bridge (via Clay-to-6th-to-Madison) be accommodated in the final design; otherwise significant signal timing adjustments will be needed for the Clay-to-7th-to-Madison to be a time-efficient alternative. We were also sincerely hoping for protected facilities on SE Madison, at least from 7th to the bridge, and were disappointed that these were not included, although implementing an all-day bus lane, moving the LIT lane curbside, and banning right turns onto Grand was a good consolation design. On Hawthorne, we do not think the parking lane should be pro-time; if you watch traffic movement at rush hour today, the leftmost lane is not well used, and as such automobiles will go flying down the hill next to bumper-to-bumper traffic, which creates a significant hazard for anyone trying to cross Hawthorne, regardless of mode. Maintaining the parking lane all day (with properly daylighted intersections of course) is the more safety-oriented option.

Conclusion: Hawthorne/Madison/Clay is a critical route in our LIT network that is already well-used, and would be a great project to construct with permanent, robust materials (perhaps as a signature project) were it not for major concerns about capacity. We have unfortunately concluded that this project may be better constructed with temporary materials in the short term, and more permanently rebuilt after we have a better sense of LIT usage on the route. We would not want this important route to suffer from the eternal-limbo fate of other semi-protected facilities (such as NE Multnomah), so it might be prudent to tag and set aside the funds needed to make the route permanent, to be used after further study (and perhaps the political will necessary to road-diet Hawthorne and/or designate the outermost Hawthorne Bridge lanes as transit-only). However, we do acknowledge the proposed designs are still an improvement over the status quo, and would like to see the project make the final cut for CCIM in some form.

⑬ NE Multnomah / NE 16th --- \$4,000,000

The good: One of Portland's first protected bike lanes, Multnomah is overdue for permanent treatment. The paint is fading, the planters get smashed and pushed on a regular basis.

Multnomah provides a relatively flat, direct, and low-stress route though the Lloyd (compared with high-stress Broadway/Weidler to the north or winding, hilly Lloyd to the south). It would be good to up the robustness of the protection on this route, and eliminate bus/LIT conflicts. We've heard that Go Lloyd identified this route as a priority project in their neighborhood; we greatly appreciate their efforts to improve this and other routes in the area for active transportation, and value their input on this matter.

The bad: The current parking-protected bike lanes have some issues, namely with poorly parked vehicles that block or infringe upon the bike lane, so this would need to be prevented (perhaps with a door-zone curb?). From what we have heard, Go Lloyd's intended facility may be superior to the one presented in the CCIM open house, with robust planters and less parking. While we feel it's time to upgrade Multnomah to "permanently protected" status, \$4 million is a lot, and we're concerned that choosing this corridor (which despite its sad-looking state works relatively well) might edge out projects on corridors that have worse/no infrastructure or more desperate safety issues.

Conclusion: While BikeLoud had not identified Multnomah as a critical priority project, we appreciate the work Go Lloyd has put toward maintaining the temporary planters and designing a permanent Multnomah, and want to support their request for funds to improve the corridor. We still have concerns that this project might edge out a street more likely to be the scene of a major crash or fatality, but perhaps a compromise could be reached in terms of funding (such as relying on Lloyd-specific SDCs), rolling out the upgrade in stages, or only upgrading blocks where the temporary infrastructure is most showing wear and tear.

⑭ SE Water / Stark / 2nd -- \$2,520,000

The good: The existing bike facilities on Water are subpar, and were the scene of a fatal crash last summer involving a woman on a bike. We recognize conflicts exist between faster and slower users on the Esplanade, and appreciate efforts to offer an alternative for faster traffic (similar to Naito and the Waterfront Path downtown). Water is not an easy street to cross during high-traffic times, and this project would help facilitate access to the river, as well as the small but popular commercial district along the corridor. We're normally not huge fans of two-way facilities, but the lesser number of streets and driveways on the west side of the street make it sensible here. We also like the direct route on 3rd once the LIT facility leaves Stark to continue north.

The bad: Compared to the other north-south route proposals for the Central Eastside, Water is a bit useless, unless you're trying to visit a destination on the corridor. Water does not connect to the Esplanade at-grade north of Salmon, and the street itself only goes north as far as Stark. 3rd will get you a little farther, but no farther north than the Burnside corridor (i.e. it does not connect across Sullivan's Gulch to N/NE Portland). Worse, Water is on the wrong side of the freight tracks for most travel through the Central Eastside, and using the facility means risking

getting caught by a freight train, with Hawthorne on the far southern end serving as the only way to get across a slow or stopped train. We're also concerned that the proposed facility might work poorly with the major changes coming to the OMSI property, and don't want to spend millions on a project that we might regret being designed the way it is in 10 years. Its efficacy in the network also relies on the east-west streets that connect to it (Clay, Salmon, Belmont/Morrison, Ankeny/Burnside/Couch/Davis), so making Water part of our AAA network without also improving these connector streets would be a somewhat wasted effort.

Conclusion: While it would be nice to have, this project is somewhere near the bottom of the priority list when comparing the 18 possible projects. It might be worth considering implementing it with very cheap materials, but only if it does not edge out other more important projects. We do not want PBOT to forget about the street entirely, and think it deserves another look both as part of the OMSI project, and also if the day ever comes that more northern connections to the Esplanade (perhaps via ODOT property?) can be constructed.

⑮ NE Lloyd Blvd -- \$1,000,000

The good: The lack of roads to the south make the two-way facility sensible. Traveling from 12th or 7th to the Esplanade, one would only interact with intersections at MLK and Grand. We anticipate that this route will be mostly used by people traveling to/from the Esplanade/Steel Bridge to 7th, 12th, or the future Green Loop, and are likely to be traffic-sensitive "interested-but-concerned" types, so this fully-separated (all but MLK/Grand) facility will appeal to them. We've heard Go Lloyd has identified this facility as one of their priority projects for the area. This is also one of the cheaper possible projects, and may be easier to fit into the final budget, even as a final addition.

The bad: Lloyd already has LIT facilities that are not comfortable, but are not among the worst safety risks either. Until Sullivan's Crossing--and perhaps even until the Green Loop--has been constructed, we do not anticipate this route's getting much increased use. Multnomah and Broadway/Weidler both access more destinations in Lloyd and are flatter and less winding, making Lloyd the least-usable of the three proposed east-west corridors through the area. Lloyd is also louder than Multnomah and experiences worse air quality on account of I-84, and may not be a very pleasant ride no matter how lovely the protected bike lane. Once the Green Loop is in place we anticipate it will get used for easy access to and from the Eastbank Esplanade and lower Steel Bridge, however much of this traffic will be families, tourists, and other riders interested in a more social ride where they can easily communicate and keep an eye on others traveling with them. We are concerned that the proposed two-way facility may not be wide enough to accommodate this type of traffic, especially around the new Sullivan's Crossing north bridgehead, and that those trying to cross Lloyd to head north may have a poor time unless the intersections are reworked substantially (especially the one at 12th). Perhaps the final nail in the coffin for this project, however, is the MAX track underpass, where there may not be enough

width for properly protected bike lanes (this is the stretch that would need robust protection the most).

Conclusion: While we would like to echo Go Lloyd's support for this project, given everything the organization does for active transportation, BikeLoud members feel the project just doesn't address enough of the goals of CCIM compared to other projects on the list. We would much rather see Multnomah and Broadway/Weidler be strengthened as LIT-friendly routes, as both are more useful (and Broadway/Weidler has major safety and comfort problems that need to be addressed). This attitude may very well change once Sullivan's Crossing is constructed and route patterns and desires shift. We also think this project will be important to construct prior to or in tandem with the Green Loop, and the design of the Green Loop may in fact change the way this project is designed and/or built, another reason to perhaps hold off for now. We would not oppose its being built on the cheap (less than the estimated \$1 million price tag), however even for that category it rates fairly low for us, simply because the route isn't that useful.

⑩ NW Park / 9th -- \$4,700,000

The good: We like the pedestrian crossing treatments proposed, especially at Burnside. We also really like the NW 9th Ave protected bike lanes, as this is one of only a few entry points into the Pearl and Old Town/Chinatown on account of the train tracks, and the route has too many autos on it to be a shared facility.

The bad: This project seems like a step toward the Green Loop that would not actually help construction of the Green Loop. The Green Loop will either need intersection priority (flipped stop signs) or full signals (HAWK at minimum) to be the kind of recreational, family-friendly, zero-stress facility that is being pitched. Implementing anything less than that at intersections now that might need to be ripped out and upgraded later is a waste of money. Similarly, the LIT lanes along the park blocks would have to be completely ripped out and redone to make for a much wider Green Loop facility, and given that NW Park and 8th are already fairly low-stress streets, we're not sure LIT lanes through here as a holdover until the Green Loop's construction would be a good use of resources. While we do like the proposal for NW 9th, once the Flanders greenway goes in, particularly if it connects with Naito, 9th will be a much less crucial entry into the area, especially as it requires crossing freight tracks twice, opening LIT users up to getting trapped on the wrong side of the tracks, sometimes for very long stretches of time.

Conclusion: This project is at the bottom of our priority list, and we might go so far as to actually request it not be done at all. Broadway/4th, and even 14th, are much higher priority projects in this vicinity. NW 9th would still benefit from improvements (even if its usefulness is trumped by Flanders) and we do want to see better crossings near Burnside and O'Bryant Square (acknowledging of course that the Green Loop will require practically dummy-proof intersections, and any treatments now should live up to that high standard), so perhaps these project elements can be absorbed into other projects, CCIM or otherwise.

⑰ SW Naito -- \$4,000,000

BikeLoud is currently working on the issue of permanent Naito (“Best Naito,” if you will), and our thoughts and desires about this project are laid out in those correspondences in more detail. What follows is a high-level general summary of our stance on Naito.

The good: Very popular route, both with visitors and recreational LIT users as well as with commuters looking for a fast route not impeded by signals every 200 feet (whether it’s correct form or not, the reality is most LIT users treat red lights on the facility as stop signs or “yield to people crossing” signs). We also appreciate the history of Better Naito and all the grassroots effort that has gone into the facility, and want to see a happy end to the story. We have brainstormed a lot of wonderful and creative ideas for ways the facility could not only be made permanent, but even enhance the park by activating what is a sadly underutilized space, such as through the addition of benches, tables, more greenery, and/or food carts and vendor stands.

The bad: We do not want the construction of “Best Naito” to result in any loss of park space for the sake of automotive capacity; this is non-negotiable. We also think that Naito from the median east has a lot of potential for not only a transportation corridor but also as a placemaking space, and we do not want a sub-par, compromise facility to hinder this potential. The lack of publicly available information on this project is extremely concerning to us, and we do not have confidence that this yet-to-be-revealed final design will be an improvement over current Better Naito. The temporary version of Better Naito is already transformative, and we do not think the concrete version will gain substantially more users than a year round Better Natio. We think additional designs for no-park impact options should be available for consideration by the public.

Conclusion: Given that the final proposal for Naito is not known at this time, we are extremely hesitant to put any support toward including the project in CCIM, despite its critical place in our transportation (and now recreation) network. We want to see the temporary Better Naito kept in place year-round until a final design for a permanent version can be completed, publicly vetted, and funded, and believe this process may operate better outside of CCIM than as part of it. CCIM funds are better spent on projects that both the city and advocates feel can be constructed as their best selves.

⑱ NE Broadway / Weidler -- \$4,980,000

The good: Broadway/Weidler’s existing LIT facilities are uncomfortable at best, and dangerous at worst. LIT facilities would open up this commercial corridor to more trips and business from LIT users, who currently avoid the couplet. Broadway/Weidler are also direct routes for inter- as well as intra-neighborhood trips, and are highly intuitive routes given their prominence and

connection to downtown via the Broadway Bridge. If paired with the Broadway/4th project, LIT connectivity between downtown and N/NE Portland would become greatly improved.

The bad: We're sorely disappointed the project does not expand all the way to the Central City borders (and beyond!). We have heard this is due to a small but vocal amount of business resistance, and anticipate that were this project implemented, these business owners would see for themselves what study after study has concluded: LIT facilities in an urban environment boost business. Even terminating at 7th, we anticipate the LIT facilities will attract a lot of users to/from downtown, and are concerned about capacity in the LIT lane. Regarding overall street vibe, three lanes of automotive traffic in the same direction also makes for a loud, intimidating, and dangerous street for those trying to cross at unsignalized intersections, and we would like to see the couplet traffic-calmed; BAT lanes might be a step in the right direction. We've heard from Go Lloyd that they have concerns about how this project will interface with the ODOT I-5 Rose Quarter project, and it seems they have unanswered questions on that front. We don't deny this concern, and obviously would not want to see improvements made to this corridor and then shortly afterward ripped out or otherwise undermined, however BikeLoud members who use the Broadway Bridge today would like to see improved LIT facilities installed ASAP on account of major safety concerns.

Conclusion: While Go Lloyd's comments about the Rose Quarter interstate and capping project give us pause, we also clearly hear the concerns of those who currently use (or wish they could use) the couplet and currently fear for their safety. While perhaps not at the very top of our list, we have identified this as an important project, and hope that it can be part of the CCIM. Unfortunately due to the high-traffic and auto-oriented nature of the streets, facility construction with temporary, cheap, or anything other than robust, physically-separated materials would not be recommended, so we cannot in good faith recommend a "build it for cheap now and reassess later" approach to this project.

Conclusion

Thank you for your consideration of our feedback. We look forward to seeing the final form of CCIM, and eagerly anticipate the day these plans can be experienced in person on the ground.

Sincerely,

Emily Guise, Co-chair, BikeLoudPDX
Catie Gould, Co-chair, BikeLoudPDX