

MINUTES
MULTNOMAH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
NOVEMBER 13, 1990 MEETING

Chair Gladys McCoy convened the meeting at 9:30 a.m., with Vice-Chair Gretchen Kafoury, Commissioners Pauline Anderson and Sharron Kelley present and Commissioner Rick Bauman absent.

1. **First Reading of an ORDINANCE Adopting the Multnomah County Bicycle Master Plan and Amending the Bikeways Plan Map of the Comprehensive Framework Plan Policy 33C**

Chair McCoy read the proposed ordinance by title only. Copies of the complete document were available for those wishing them.

Transportation Division Bikeways Planner Ed Pickering presented the staff report and advised that passage of the proposed ordinance would result in adoption of the Bicycle Master Plan as a component of the County's Master Transportation Plan and amendments to Comprehensive Framework Policy 33C adding and deleting selected bikeways.

In response to a question of Chair McCoy, Mr. Pickering reported that staff has identified some potential providers to assist with funding for bicycle safety education and training programs.

In response to a question of Commissioner Kelley, Mr. Pickering advised that because it is a State route as well as a National Historic site, they have not determined whether the scenic highway can be developed in a way that changes its character. Mr. Pickering reported that shoulder bikeways can be added as the County repaves roads in certain rural areas.

In response to Commissioner Kelley expressing concern about the Plan not addressing problems or solutions with bikeways in the scenic highway area, Mr. Pickering stated that staff is not opposed to designating bicycle routes in the Corbett area if there is a demand for them and that staff would be willing to work with the Gorge people to come up with a comprehensive solution.

Commissioner Kelley advised she feels the Plan should state that the County is willing to start working on the problem of establishing an equitable coexistence between motorists and bicyclists.

Mr. Pickering reported the Plan proposes that a standing committee of volunteer citizens be established to provide input and guidance to the bicycle planning program and that the County be allowed to coordinate and facilitate a bicycle education and training program. Mr. Pickering thanked members of the Sauvie Island Bicycle Planning Taskforce and the countywide Bicycle Planning Taskforce for their many hours and viable input.

Chair McCoy added her thanks to the citizen groups.

In response to a question of Chair McCoy, Mr. Pickering advised the 2 citizen groups have completed their tasks and that many of them may wish to be appointed to a standing committee.

In response to a question of Chair McCoy, Mr. Pickering explained the 40 mile loop land trust group is dealing with a regional bicycle and hiking system and that the County's standing committee would be a component within that group which would insure input at the local level on developing the loop within the County and on developing a bicycle network on roads to connect to the 40 mile loop.

In response to a question of Chair McCoy, Mr. Pickering explained the Master Plan process is developed every 5 years and suggested that the standing committee could hear citizen input and make recommendations to the Board regarding interim additions or amendments to the bikeways map.

Commissioner Anderson stated she is convinced that gas tax monies which go to bicycle paths are well spent but that funding for off-road paths should come from bicycle licenses or recreational user fees.

County Engineer Larry Nicholas explained that 1% gas tax monies cannot be used for bicycle trails not connected or within the County road system right-of-way.

Commissioner Anderson moved, and Commissioner Kelley seconded, for approval of the first reading of the proposed ordinance.

Jim Vann of 21005 NW Sauvie Island Road, testified in opposition to the proposed ordinance on behalf of Sauvie Island Grange No. 840 and advised the Grange does not support putting a bike path along a 2 mile portion of the Sauvie Island dike.

In response to questions of Commissioner Anderson, Mr. Vann explained that he understands there is a proposal to build a bike path on the berm on the water side of Multnomah Channel which is part of the dike system; and described a berm.

In response to a request of Commissioner Anderson, Mr. Pickering explained there is a proposal in the Bicycle Capital Improvement Plan as to what type of facility would be developed on Sauvie Island Road but that the proposal in the Bicycle Master Plan merely designates the area for future development without specifying what that development should be. Mr. Pickering advised that the Capital Improvement Plan is not what is before the Board today, but whether the County wants to plan for bicycle travel on Sauvie Island Road. Mr. Pickering suggested that construction of a bicycle path on the dike would not remove any fill, reduce the flood-holding capabilities or affect the structural integrity of the dike and that it would heighten the bench.

In response to a question of Chair McCoy, Mr. Pickering reported the Sauvie Island Taskforce came up with other options and rather than making a specific proposal, those options were listed in the Capital Improvement Plan and that final determination is being withheld pending further information. Mr. Pickering explained that the Capital Improvement Plan is the vehicle by which the County budgets bicycle monies to develop bikeways and schedules construction and development of projects through a public process.

Jean Fears of 18143 NW Reeder Road, read and submitted the statement of Jane Brunner in opposition to the proposed construction of a bike path on the berm of the Sauvie Island dike.

Chair McCoy directed that Mr. Pickering review Ms. Brunner's letter and develop a response to her concerns prior to the second reading of the proposed ordinance.

Mary Schick of 16525 NW Gillihan Road, testified in opposition to the proposed construction of a bike path on the berm of the Sauvie Island dike and advised she is in favor of putting a bike path on Sauvie Island. Ms. Schick discussed areas of potential danger for bicyclists and expressed concern for waterfront land or irrigation systems on the berm side of the dike, advising she would support a gradual widening of the road in order to have a better bike path if it did not require expending a great deal of money or disrupt the livelihood of affected property owners.

Del Reeder of 24512 NW Reeder Road, testified in opposition to construction of a bike path on the berm of the Sauvie Island dike, advising the cost of construction would be too high compared to the number of people it would benefit.

Grant Johnson of 17505 NW Sauvie Island Road, discussed the lack of funding available for construction of bike paths and expressed concern that the Plan does not address maintenance funding for previously constructed paths. Mr. Johnson explained the steps necessary in order to construct a bike path on the berm of the Sauvie Island dike and on the Cornelius Pass Road and expressed concern over the amount of funding such undertakings would require, advising he does not believe the Plan is ready for the Board's endorsement.

Richard Roberts of Preston Thorgrimson, advised his law firm is legal counsel to the Sauvie Island Drainage District. Mr. Roberts discussed the powers and responsibilities of the District, stating the District should be a party to any planning processes which may affect it. Mr. Roberts advised that in 1974 the District Board of Supervisors adopted a policy in opposition to having bicycle paths within District easements and that in 1989 the policy was refined to indicate District easements should be used solely for repair and maintenance of District levees. Mr. Roberts requested that the District be included in processes concerning it.

Donna Matrazzo of 19300 NW Sauvie Island Road, Sauvie Island Bicycle Planning Taskforce member, testified in support of the plan to put a separate bike path along a 2 mile section of the Sauvie Island dike, stating it was more economically feasible than widening the dike road. Ms. Matrazzo cited statistics illustrating the need for bicycle safety for young and inexperienced riders.

Ken Larson of 17929 NW St. Helen Road, discussed traffic hazards on Cornelius Pass, expressing concern over the feasibility of constructing bicycle paths on Cornelius Pass and Sauvie Island Road and naming other roads he felt would be safer. Mr. Larson suggested that the funds necessary to construct a bike path on Sauvie Island Road would be better spent elsewhere.

In response to Vice-Chair Kafoury advising she wants some assurance that plans to specifically change Sauvie Island Road are not in the Bicycle Plan, and that the Board be clear about what voting for the Master Plan means in the context of the issues raised today, Commissioner Anderson reported that there are no specifics in the Plan and that she expects some input from the Board and citizens as to how and where a bike path would ultimately be constructed in the Sauvie Island area.

Commissioner Kelley expressed concern over the Plan's lack of information and commitment about the Gorge area.

The first reading of the ordinance was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED. Chair McCoy advised the second reading is scheduled for Tuesday, December 4, 1990.

There being no further business, the formal meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

OFFICE OF THE BOARD CLERK
for MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

By DEBORAH C. ROGERS

ANNOTATED MINUTES

Tuesday, November 13, 1990 - 9:30 AM
Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

FORMAL ITEM

1. First Reading of an ORDINANCE Adopting the Multnomah County Bicycle Master Plan and Amending the Bikeways Plan Map of the Comprehensive Framework Plan Policy 33C

TESTIMONY HEARD. FIRST READING APPROVED.
SECOND READING SCHEDULED FOR TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1990.

Tuesday, November 13 - 10:00 AM
Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

INFORMAL BRIEFINGS

2. Briefing on the Multnomah Cable Regulatory Commission's 1989-90 Annual Report. Presented by Julie Omelchuck

RESCHEDULED FOR TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1990.

3. Informal Review of Formal Agenda of November 15, 1990

R-10 REMOVED FROM AGENDA AT THE REQUEST OF DEPARTMENT.

Wednesday, November 14, 1990 - 9:00 - 11:30 AM

Standard Plaza Building
1100 SW Sixth Avenue
3rd Floor Conference Rooms A & B

POLICY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

Discussion of Items Related to Continuing Analysis of County Mission and Ballot Measure #5 Consequences

NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR MONDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1990, 9:00 TO 4:00, PORTLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BOARDROOM.

Thursday, November 15, 1990 - 9:30 AM
Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

FORMAL MEETING

NON-DEPARTMENTAL

1. Informal Briefing on Multnomah County Child Abuse Task Force Legislative Agenda Recommendations. Presented by David Fuks and Helen Smith. (Time Certain 9:30 AM)

CONSENT CALENDAR
JUSTICE SERVICES
SHERIFF'S OFFICE

- C-1 Liquor License Application Renewals Submitted by Sheriff's Office with Recommendation for Approval as Follows:
Dispenser Class A for (a) Colwood Golf Course, 7313 NE Columbia Blvd, Portland; (b) The Woodshed, 16015 SE Stark, Portland.
Package Store for (c) Bob's Corner Grocery and Deli, 13110 SE Division, Portland; (d) Plainview Grocery, 11800 NW Cornelius Pass Rd, Portland; (e) Quick Shop Minit Mart #12, 16437 SE Powell, Portland; (f) 3-D Market, 1739 SE 139th Av, Portland.
Restaurant for (g) Chang's Mongolian Grill Restaurant, 1600 NE 122nd Av, Portland.
Retail Malt Beverage for (h) Maxine's, 16900 NW St Helens Rd, Portland.

APPROVED.

REGULAR AGENDA
NON-DEPARTMENTAL

- R-1 Confirmation of the Appointment of Robert A. Jackson as Director of the Department of Community Corrections

APPROVED.

JUSTICE SERVICES
SHERIFF'S OFFICE

- R-2 Budget Modification MCSO #11 Authorizing Reclassification of an Office Assistant 3 Position to an Administrative Secretary Position within the Enforcement Branch

APPROVED.

- R-3 Budget Modification MCSO #12 Transferring \$5,000 from the Non-Departmental Budget, Professional Services Line Item, to the Sheriff's Office Budget, Professional Services Line Item, to Pay for a Feasibility Study for a Shooting Range on Larch Mountain

TABLED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

- R-4 ORDER in the Matter of Restricting the Length of Vehicles Operating on Certain County Roads

ORDER 90-191 APPROVED.

- R-5 ORDER in the Matter of the Conveyance of a Permanent Easement together with a Temporary Construction Easement on County Land known as Raymond Park #55 to the City of Portland for Sewer Purposes

ORDER 90-192 APPROVED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES - continued

- R-6 Budget Modification DES #3 Authorizing Change in Personal Services for Transportation Division to Implement the Integrated County Road Information System (ICRIS) Database

APPROVED.

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

- R-7 Second Reading and Possible Adoption of an ORDINANCE Relating to Retiree Medical Insurance for Employees Not Covered by Collective Bargaining Agreements and Amending Ordinance No. 534 as Amended by Ordinance No. 629

SECOND READING CONTINUED TO THURSDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1990.

- R-8 Budget Modification DGS #3 Authorizing Reclassification of an Office Assistant 2 to Senior Office Assistant within the Administrative Services Division

APPROVED.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

AGING SERVICES AND JUVENILE JUSTICE DIVISIONS

- R-9 Budget Modification DHS #12 Authorizing Shift of \$113,401 in Pass-Through Weatherization Grant Funds to Personnel, Materials and Services within the Aging Services/Community Action Division to Enable the Community Action Program to Conduct Required Infiltration and Weatherization Education Services


APPROVED.

HEALTH SERVICES AND SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISIONS

- R-10 First Reading of an ORDINANCE Adopting an Ambulance Service Plan

TABLED.

* CHAIR McCOY ANNOUNCED THE BOARD WOULD CONDUCT ITS FORMAL MEETING AT 9:30 A.M. ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1990, AND ITS FORMAL MEETING BEGINNING AT 8:30 A.M. ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1990.



MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
ROOM 605, COUNTY COURTHOUSE
1021 S.W. FOURTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OREGON 97204

GLADYS McCOY • CHAIR • 248-3308
PAULINE ANDERSON • DISTRICT 1 • 248-5220
GRETCHEN KAFOURY • DISTRICT 2 • 248-5219
RICK BAUMAN • DISTRICT 3 • 248-5217
SHARRON KELLEY • DISTRICT 4 • 248-5213
CLERK'S OFFICE • 248-3277

AGENDA

MEETINGS OF THE MULTNOMAH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

FOR THE WEEK OF

NOVEMBER 12 - 16, 1990

Monday, November 12, 1990 - Veterans Day Holiday - Offices Closed
Tuesday, November 13, 1990 - 9:30 AM - Formal Meeting. . . . Page 2
Tuesday, November 13, 1990 - 10:00 AM - Informal Briefings . Page 2
Wednesday, November 14, 1990 - 9:00 - 11:30 AM Page 2
Policy Development Committee Meeting
Standard Plaza Building
1100 SW Sixth Avenue
Thursday, November 15, 1990 - 9:30 AM - Formal Meeting. . . .Page 3

Thursday Meetings of the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners are recorded and can be seen at the following times:

Thursday, 10:00 PM, Channel 11 for East and West side subscribers
Friday, 6:00 PM, Channel 27 for Paragon Cable (Multnomah East) subscribers
Saturday 12:00 PM, Channel 21 for East Portland and East County subscribers

Tuesday, November 13, 1990 - 9:30 AM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

FORMAL ITEM

1. First Reading of an ORDINANCE Adopting the Multnomah County Bicycle Master Plan and Amending the Bikeways Plan Map of the Comprehensive Framework Plan Policy 33C
-

Tuesday, November 13 - 10:00 AM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

INFORMAL BRIEFINGS

2. Briefing on the Multnomah Cable Regulatory Commission's 1989-90 Annual Report. Presented by Julie Omelchuck
 3. Informal Review of Formal Agenda of November 15, 1990
-

Wednesday, November 14, 1990 - 9:00 - 11:30 AM

Standard Plaza Building
1100 SW Sixth Avenue
3rd Floor Conference Rooms A & B

POLICY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

Discussion of Items Related to Continuing Analysis of County Mission and Ballot Measure #5 Consequences

Thursday, November 15, 1990 - 9:30 AM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

FORMAL MEETING

NON-DEPARTMENTAL

1. Informal Briefing on Multnomah County Child Abuse Task Force Legislative Agenda Recommendations. Presented by David Fuks and Helen Smith. (Time Certain 9:30 AM)

CONSENT CALENDAR

JUSTICE SERVICES

SHERIFF'S OFFICE

- C-1 Liquor License Application Renewals Submitted by Sheriff's Office with Recommendation for Approval as Follows:
Dispenser Class A for (a) Colwood Golf Course, 7313 NE Columbia Blvd, Portland; (b) The Woodshed, 16015 SE Stark, Portland.
Package Store for (c) Bob's Corner Grocery and Deli, 13110 SE Division, Portland; (d) Plainview Grocery, 11800 NW Cornelius Pass Rd, Portland; (e) Quick Shop Minit Mart #12, 16437 SE Powell, Portland; (f) 3-D Market, 1739 SE 139th Av, Portland.
Restaurant for (g) Chang's Mongolian Grill Restaurant, 1600 NE 122nd Av, Portland.
Retail Malt Beverage for (h) Maxine's, 16900 NW St Helens Rd, Portland.

REGULAR AGENDA

NON-DEPARTMENTAL

- R-1 Confirmation of the Appointment of Robert A. Jackson as Director of the Department of Community Corrections

JUSTICE SERVICES

SHERIFF'S OFFICE

- R-2 Budget Modification MCSO #11 Authorizing Reclassification of an Office Assistant 3 Position to an Administrative Secretary Position within the Enforcement Branch
- R-3 Budget Modification MCSO #12 Transferring \$5,000 from the Non-Departmental Budget, Professional Services Line Item, to the Sheriff's Office Budget, Professional Services Line Item, to Pay for a Feasibility Study for a Shooting Range on Larch Mountain

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

- R-4 ORDER in the Matter of Restricting the Length of Vehicles Operating on Certain County Roads

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES - continued

- R-5 ORDER in the Matter of the Conveyance of a Permanent Easement together with a Temporary Construction Easement on County Land known as Raymond Park #55 to the City of Portland for Sewer Purposes
- R-6 Budget Modification DES #3 Authorizing Change in Personal Services for Transportation Division to Implement the Integrated County Road Information System (ICRIS) Database

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

- R-7 Second Reading and Possible Adoption of an ORDINANCE Relating to Retiree Medical Insurance for Employees Not Covered by Collective Bargaining Agreements and Amending Ordinance No. 534 as Amended by Ordinance No. 629
- R-8 Budget Modification DGS #3 Authorizing Reclassification of an Office Assistant 2 to Senior Office Assistant within the Administrative Services Division

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

AGING SERVICES AND JUVENILE JUSTICE DIVISIONS

- R-9 Budget Modification DHS #12 Authorizing Shift of \$113,401 in Pass-Through Weatherization Grant Funds to Personnel, Materials and Services within the Aging Services/Community Action Division to Enable the Community Action Program to Conduct Required Infiltration and Weatherization Education Services

HEALTH SERVICES AND SOCIAL SERVICES DIVISIONS

- R-10 First Reading of an ORDINANCE Adopting an Ambulance Service Plan

1

DATE 1-13-90

NAME Jim Verna

ADDRESS 21005 NW Sawville Trl.

STREET

Portland, OR 97231

CITY

ZIP CODE

I WISH TO SPEAK ON AGENDA ITEM # 1

SUBJECT Bicycle Master Plan

_____ FOR X AGAINST

PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLY!

Hot on beam

2

DATE 11-13-90

NAME Jean Fears **FEARS**

ADDRESS 18143 N. McBecker Rd

STREET

Portland 97231

CITY

ZIP CODE

I WISH TO SPEAK ON AGENDA ITEM # 4

SUBJECT Bike Path

_____ FOR X AGAINST

PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLY!

Not on beam

3

DATE 11/13/90

NAME Mary Schick

ADDRESS 016525 NW Gillihan

STREET Portland, OR 97231

CITY

ZIP CODE

I WISH TO SPEAK ON AGENDA ITEM # 33c

SUBJECT mult Co Bicycle Plan

FOR

AGAINST

PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLY!

Not on beam!

Will not use by bikers
but by joggers

Would rather broaden road
for bike path - Boosters

Strain on property owners
Could put some houses on
on island

4

DATE 1-13-90

NAME DEL T REEDER

ADDRESS 24512 NW REEDER Rd

STREET

PORTLAND

97221

CITY

ZIP CODE

I WISH TO SPEAK ON AGENDA ITEM # 1

SUBJECT Bicycle Plan

 FOR AGAINST

PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLY!

Too expensive,
not necessary
Too risky

5

DATE 11/13/90

NAME Grant Johnson

ADDRESS 17505-T NW Sawvie Is. Rd.

STREET

Portland OR 97231

CITY

ZIP CODE

I WISH TO SPEAK ON AGENDA ITEM # 1

SUBJECT Bicycle Master Plan

 FOR ✓ AGAINST

PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLY!

not only to build but must be
maintained - via funds

Plan not specific or ready
yet.

#

10

DATE

11-13-90

NAME

Richard D Roberts

ADDRESS

Preston, Thurgimson, Atty for ^{Sauvie} Island
1115 SW 5th Portland, Ore 97204
Drange Dist

STREET

CITY

ZIP CODE

I WISH TO SPEAK ON AGENDA ITEM #

1

SUBJECT

Bike Path Plan Amendment

FOR

AGAINST

PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLY!

Legal Council to drainage
District - not been party to
planning
1972 + 89 - No bike paths

7

DATE 11/13/90

NAME DONNA MATBAZZO

ADDRESS 19300 NW Sunrise Island Rd

STREET

Portland OR 97231

CITY

ZIP CODE

I WISH TO SPEAK ON AGENDA ITEM # _____

SUBJECT MASTER BIKE PLAN

V FOR _____ AGAINST

PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLY!

Thought task force had agreed
to plan for bike path

Meeting Date: NOV 13 1990

Agenda No.: #1

(Above space for Clerk's Office Use)

AGENDA PLACEMENT FORM
(For Non-Budgetary Items)

SUBJECT: Ordinance
Bicycle Master Plan and Bikeways Map in Comprehensive Plan

BCC Informal _____ BCC Formal November 13 & 20, 1990
(date) (date)

DEPARTMENT Environmental Services DIVISION Planning and Development

CONTACT Gary Clifford TELEPHONE 248-3043

PERSON(S) MAKING PRESENTATION Ed Pickering

ACTION REQUESTED:

INFORMATIONAL ONLY POLICY DIRECTION APPROVAL

ESTIMATED TIME NEEDED ON BOARD AGENDA: 30 minutes

CHECK IF YOU REQUIRE OFFICIAL WRITTEN NOTICE OF ACTION TAKEN: X

BRIEF SUMMARY (include statement of rationale for action requested, as well as personnel and fiscal/budgetary impacts, if applicable):
Request adoption of the Bicycle Master Plan which will guide strategies to complete a Countywide bikeways system in conformance with the County Comprehensive Framework Plan Policy 33C.

The Bikeways Map in Framework Plan Policy 33C will be updated to reflect city annexations, light rail construction and connections to new bike routes of other jurisdictions.

(If space is inadequate, please use other side)

SIGNATURES:

ELECTED OFFICIAL _____

Or

DEPARTMENT MANAGER Jana Stibel for PY

(All accompanying documents must have required signatures)

NOV 13 1990 11:30 AM
CLERK OF COUNTY OF OREGON

ORDINANCE FACT SHEET

Ordinance Title: An Ordinance Adopting the Bicycle Master Plan and Amending the Bikeway Plan Map of Framework Plan Policy 33C

Give a brief statement of the purpose of the ordinance (include the rationale for adoption of ordinance, description of persons benefited, and other alternatives explored).

The ordinance will amend the Bikeways map of the Comprehensive Framework Plan; and adopts the Bicycle Master Plan as a component of the County Master Transportation Plan. The bike plan will be the County bicycling vision for the 1990's be used as a budgeting tool, provides for public input to the County Bicycle Program and identifies implementation strategies, opportunities, and problems

What other local jurisdictions in the metropolitan area have enacted similar legislation?

Washington County and Clackamas County as well as the State of Oregon have each adopted bicycle master plans and bikeway maps. Many cities in the metropolitan area have adopted bicycle plans and bikeways maps including the cities of Portland and Gresham within Multnomah County.

What has been the experience in other areas with this type of legislation?

Many cities and counties in Oregon have adopted bicycle master plans that are used as the basis for subsequent decisions, including capital budgeting, road construction, and maintenance scheduling.


What is the fiscal impact, if any?

No change will occur in income of the Bike Fund's 1% County gas tax revenue. Capital expenditures will be based on needs identified in a Bicycle Capital Improvement Plan. The Bike CIP will be based on the revised and more definitive bicycle plan. Maintenance funding will increase in proportion to total bike funds available as the new plan identifies the need for a higher level of bikeway maintenance.

The Bicycle Master Plan proposes seeking supplemental funds to resolve bicycle needs that are unable to be funded from current sources. Additions and deletions the Comprehensive Framework Plan-Bikeways Map will have no effect on income, but may alter the location or scheduling of capital expenditures.

(If space is inadequate, please use other side)

SIGNATURES:

Person Filling Out Form: 

Planning & Budget Division (if fiscal impact): _____

Department Manager/Elected Official: _____

1 BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
2 FOR MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON
3 ORDINANCE NO.
4

5 An ordinance adopting the Multnomah County Bicycle Master Plan and amending the
6 Bikeways Plan Map of the Comprehensive Framework Plan Policy 33C.

7 Multnomah County Ordains as follows:

8 Section I. Findings.

9 (A) Comprehensive Framework Plan Policy 33C states the County's policy to identify
10 streets with good bicycle access and travel potential for designation of future bike route
11 construction projects and to assure that future street improvements will be designed to
12 accommodate bicycles.

13 (B) In 1989, the Multnomah County Transportation Division updated the Bicycle
14 portions of the Framework Plan last amended in 1983.

15 (C) A Countywide Bicycle Planning Task Force and a Sauvie Island Bicycle Planning
16 Task Force comprised of concerned citizens assisted in the Bicycle Plan update.

17 (D) All affected local, regional, and State governmental agencies were contacted in
18 order to assure a coordinated countywide bicycle network.

19 (E) The resulting Bicycle Master Plan, August, 1990, and the amendment of the
20 Framework Plan Policy 33C Bikeways Map fulfill Statewide Planning Goals Number 1,
21 Citizen Involvement; Number 8, Recreation; Number 12, Transportation; and Number 13,
22 Energy Conservation as demonstrated in the Findings of Exhibit A.

1 (F) Policy 33C of the Multnomah County Comprehensive Framework Plan was
2 acknowledged to be in conformance with the Statewide Planning Goals by the State
3 Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) in 1980. A later amendment of
4 Policy 33C in 1983 was also approved by DLCD. Adoption of the Bicycle Master Plan and the
5 Bikeways Maps do not change any text in Plan Policy 33C.

6 (G) Exhibit A Sections 5 through 10 (the Staff Report) and Exhibit B (the Bicycle
7 Master Plan, August 1990), incorporated as part of these Findings, explain how all amendments
8 to the Bikeways Map in Policy 33C comply with the Framework Plan Policies and are
9 necessary to reflect changes that have occurred since the last update of the transportation
10 portion of the Plan in 1983. The changes include city annexations, completion of east side light
11 rail transit construction and new land use designations.

12 (H) The Bicycle Master Plan will be a component of the Multnomah County Master
13 Transportation Plan which supplements the Comprehensive Framework Plan. The Bicycle
14 Master Plan includes objectives and policies consistent with Framework Plan Policy 33C.
15 Those objectives and policies control the strategic actions which implement Policy 33C.

16 (I) The Bicycle Master Plan and 1990 Bikeway Plan Maps were considered at a public
17 hearing on October 8, 1990 before the Planning Commission and on November 13 and
18 November 20, 1990 before the Board of County Commissioners where all interested persons
19 were given an opportunity to appear and be heard.

20 Section II. Purpose.

21 (A) The Bicycle Master Plan, August 1990 (Exhibit B) is adopted as a component of
22 the Master Transportation Plan.

23 (B) The accompanying five 1990 Bikeway Plan Maps designated Exhibit C is adopted
24 to replace the one 1983 Bikeways Map which follows page 152 in the Comprehensive
25 Framework Plan Policy 33C.

26

1 Section III. Adoption.

2 This ordinance being necessary for the health, safety, and welfare of the people of
3 Multnomah County, shall take effect on the thirtieth day after its adoption, pursuant to Section
4 5.50 of the Charter of Multnomah County.

5 ADOPTED THIS _____ day of _____, 1990, being the date of its
6 second reading before the Board of County Commissioners of Multnomah County.

7

8 (SEAL)

9

10

By _____
Gladys McCoy, County Chair
MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

11


12

13

14 REVIEWED:

15

16



John DuBay, Deputy County Counsel
of Multnomah County, Oregon

17

18

19

20

21


22

23

24

25

26



**Department of Environmental Services
Division of Planning and Development
2115 S.E. Morrison Street
Portland, Oregon 97214 (503) 248-3043**

EXHIBIT A

Staff Report

This Staff Report consists of Findings of Fact and Conclusions

November 13, 1990

**C 2-90 Adoption of the Bicycle Master Plan, August, 1990
and Comprehensive Plan Amendment of the Bikeways Map in Policy 33C**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the submitted Ordinance which adopts the Bicycle Master Plan, August 1990 and amends the Bikeways Map in Multnomah County Comprehensive Framework Plan Policy 33C.

Findings of Fact:

1. Compliance with Statewide Planning Goal No. 1, Citizen Involvement:

GOAL: To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.

- A. A Countywide public information forum was held December 5, 1989, to apprise the public of the Bicycle Master Plan program and solicit public input.**
- B. A public information forum regarding bicycle planning and biking problems on Sauvie Island was held on January 8, 1990 sponsored by the Sauvie Island Grange.**
- C. The Countywide Bicycle Planning Task Force was formed of 11 volunteer citizens representing various cities, geographic areas, and bicycle interests, to provide guidance and input to the Bicycle Master Plan.**
- D. The Sauvie Island Bicycle Planning Task Force was formed of five representative Sauvie Island residents to provide public involvement and feedback during development of the Bicycle Master Plan.**

2. **Compliance with Statewide Planning Goal No. 8, Recreational Needs:**

GOAL: To satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors and, where appropriate, to provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities including destination resorts.

Designating and developing bike routes that have high scenic value and lead to recreational destinations, in close proximity to a relatively dense urban population, satisfies a recreational need of residents and visitors to Multnomah County. Promoting safe and convenient bicycling recreation maximizes energy conservation both in transportation to recreational destinations and as a recreational activity of itself.

3. **Compliance with Statewide Planning Goal No. 12, Transportation:**

GOAL: To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system.

Bikeway route additions and deletions are based on criteria of providing safe and convenient bicycle travel with an economically cost-efficient bikeway system.

4. **Compliance with Statewide Planning Goal No. 13, Energy Conservation:**

GOAL: To conserve energy.

Development of County bikeways, based upon an up-to-date Bikeways Map, provides for a highly energy-efficient mode of travel and a reasonable alternative to motorized travel for certain types of trips. A comprehensive and connected bikeway system promotes bicycling and conservation of energy through a relative reduction in depletion of non-renewable energy resources.

5. **Consistency of revisions to the Bikeways Plan Map with the Multnomah County Comprehensive Framework Plan (CFP) Policy 33C:**

- A. Streets with good bicycle access and travel potential are identified.
- B. Identification and approval of bikeway routes provides for future bike route projects.
- C. Future street improvement projects on newly designated bike routes will be designed to accommodate bicycles.
- D. Additional routes will provide for commuter bicycle trips, and recreational bicycle travel.

6. **Criteria for deletion of bike routes from the Bikeways Plan Map in (CFP) Policy 33C:**

- A. Proposed bike routes were deleted when located outside of County jurisdiction including routes on road rights-of-way belonging to City of Troutdale or City of Fairview. Many proposed bike routes on the 1983 Bikeway Map are designated for roads that have been transferred to the City of Portland following annexation and should no longer be considered for implementation as County bikeways.

- B. Development of the Light Rail Transit Line in East Multnomah County has created a need for alternative bike routes at various locations.
 - C. Streets developed to urban standards but without bicycle facilities are deleted from the Bikeway Map where reasonable alternative routes exist.
7. **Criteria for the addition of bike routes to the Bikeways Plan Map in (CFP) Policy 33C:**
- A. Planned bike routes are extended to connect to and provide access to the Johnson Creek/Belrose Line 40-Mile Loop Trail.
 - B. The future Johnson Creek/Belrose Trail and Two Rivers Trail, as part of the 40-Mile Loop system, are added as bikeways.
 - C. Bike routes on roads constructed since 1982 are added to provide access between the County bikeway system and the Interstate 84 bike path.
 - D. Existing built bike routes are recognized as bikeways on the Bikeway Map.
 - E. Alternative bikeway routes are added to circumvent travel barriers and obstacles, and routes with physical constraints to bicycling.
 - F. Bikeways are added that connect the County system to bikeways to be provided by other jurisdictions including the State of Oregon, Clackamas County and City of Gresham.
 - G. Alternative bike routes were added as preferred routes where existing streets have been built to urban standards yet are substandard for bicycle use.
 - H. Rural bike routes were added where:
 - (1) Direct access can be provided to the urban area.
 - (2) Access can be provided to rural service centers.
 - (3) Linkages can be provided from the urban area to recreational destinations, such as Oxbow Park.
 - (4) Where substantial bicycling activity currently occurs on a potentially hazardous route.
8. The Bicycle Master Plan is a component of the Multnomah County Master Transportation Plan, and is also a supportive plan of strategic actions to the Comprehensive Framework Plan Policy 33C.

9. Bicycling is an increasingly popular recreational activity and mode of travel such that there is an increasing need to provide a bicycle-friendly street system and to further develop the 133 miles of unbuilt County bikeways.
10. The objectives of the Bicycle Master Plan are to:
 - A. Increase bicyclist and motorist knowledge and awareness so as to resolve hazards and conflicts of bicycling and reduce the occurrence of bicycle related accidents.
 - B. Develop and maintain an extensive network of bicycle transportation facilities that provide safe, efficient, and enjoyable bicycle travel.
11. The Bicycle Master Plan identifies prevailing problems to providing a safe and convenient bicycling environment and proposes various implementation strategies to mitigate the following:
 - A. Funding constraints on use of State Highway Trust funds, which limits expenditures on bikeway projects to traveled road rights-of-way and precludes development of off-road mountain-bike and 40-Mile Loop facilities.
 - B. The lack of bicycle safety training and greater need for enforcement of vehicle laws on bicyclists, so as to reduce the rate of bicyclist-caused traffic accidents.
12. Ongoing citizen involvement and community participation in the County bicycle planning and development process is desirable and can be achieved through the Bicycle Master Plan strategy of establishing a volunteer committee of citizens and bicyclists to advise the County Bicycle Program on bikeway development and bicycle programs.

Conclusion:

1. The Multnomah County Bicycle Master Plan, August 1990 fulfills the applicable Statewide Planning Goals.
2. The Bicycle Master Plan and amendments to the Bikeways Map in CFP Policy 33c comply with the stated Policies of CFP Policy 33C.
3. Adoption of the Bicycle Master Plan will endorse objectives and policies which control strategic actions implementing Policy 33C.



BICYCLE MASTER PLAN

MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON



August, 1990



PREPARED BY

Multnomah County

Department of Environmental Service

Transportation Division



BICYCLE MASTER PLAN

MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON



PREPARED BY

Multnomah County

Department of Environmental Service

Transportation Division

**ENACTING ORDINANCE
TO BE DONE**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Development of the Multnomah County Bicycle Master Plan was made possible through the efforts of the following people:

Board of County Commissioners

Gladys McCoy, Chair
Pauline Anderson
Rick Bauman
Gretchen Kafoury
Sharron Kelley

Planning Commission

Richard Leonard, Chair
Dean Alterman
George Douglas
William Fritz
Peter Fry
Karin Hunt
Ruth Spetter
Leonard Yoon

Multnomah County Bicycle Planning Task Force

Ron Bogh
Mark Greenblatt
Chuck Herndon
Jef Kaiser
Bruce Kwasney
Eric Lemoine
Jacquie Pancoast
Jeff Smith
Eric Tschuy

Sauvie Island Bicycle Planning Task Force

Jane Brunner
Jane Hartline
Julie Holmason
Donna Mattrazzo
Mary Schick

Department of Environmental Services

Paul Yarborough, Director

Transportation Division

Larry Nicholas, Director

Planning and Operations Support

Susie Lahsene
Scott Pemble
Ed Pickering
Anndy Wiselogle

Technical Support

Terry Howard
Velda Howell
Rosemary Justice
Cathey Kramer
Don Newell
Mike Phillips
John Shigo

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Ordinance No. _____	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	5
Background	9
Envision the Future	10
Planning Process	11
Amending the Plan	13
Jurisdiction	13
Bicycle Objectives	17
Policies and Implementation Strategies	17
Program Implementation	18
Program Funding	19
Facility Classification System	22
Bikeway Plan Maps	28
Southwest	33
West Side	34
Willamette River Bridges	35
Bikeway Hazards and Problems	38
Bikeway Design and Maintenance Guidelines	44
Appendices	
Bicycle Accident Data	72
Oregon Vehicle Code	79
Glossary	83

**EXECUTIVE
SUMMARY**

TO BE DONE

INTRODUCTION
BACKGROUND
ENVISION THE FUTURE
PLANNING PROCESS
AMENDING THE PLAN
JURISDICTION

INTRODUCTION

An estimated 88,000,000 people currently ride bicycles in the USA, with the number of adult cyclists doubling from 1983 to 1988. Through most of the 20th Century, the bicycle has been an important means of recreation and transportation for children. With increased leisure time available for recreation, and greater awareness of the benefits of physical fitness and exercise, the bicycle has regained its popularity with both adults and young adults. Bicycling is now a family event shared by children, parents, and grandparents.

The bicycle can be utilized as the mode of choice for a variety of trips:

- Commuting - to work or school using the quickest and most direct route.
- Utility - for practical trips within your neighborhood and community.
- Recreation - riding for pleasure and exercise.
- Touring - traveling by bicycle for several days or even cross-country.
- Racing - in various competitive events.



Bicyclists include everyone from youths to senior citizens. Cyclists may ride only during fair weather or all year, regardless of the weather. They may ride because they enjoy the experience, or as an efficient and inexpensive alternative to motor vehicles. Other people ride because it is a primary means of transportation available to them.

The fastest growing style of bicycling in the USA, increasing over 40% from 1983-1988 is mountain bike riding which is not confined to paved roads. The acceptance of cycling as a sport and recreational activity suggests an optimistic outlook for growth during the next 5 years, and greater recognition and respect for cyclists sharing the road.

There are many benefits of bicycling to the community, both to bicyclists and non-bicyclists.

- * Bicycles operate on human power and are the most energy efficient form of transportation
 - 50 times more efficient than automobiles, and
 - 3 times more efficient than walking.
- * Bicycles produce no air or noise pollution.
- * Bicycles can be a vital supplemental transportation mode during gasoline shortages and price increases.
- * Bicycles require little space, reducing traffic congestion and parking needs.
- * Bicycles are light weight and reduce wear on road surfaces.

Bicycling is regulated, along with motor vehicles in the Oregon Vehicle Code. Cyclists are legitimate user of public road rights-of-way and have equal access to roads in Multnomah County and throughout Oregon.

The State mandates that 1% of the County's share of State Highway Trust Fund monies shall be spent toward planning, design, construction, and maintenance of bicycle and pedestrian facilities within County road rights-of-way (ORS 366.514).

Bicycle facilities are developed in accordance with State of Oregon standards and American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) guidelines.

Within this context, and with increased awareness of the benefits of bicycling, Multnomah County has taken a proactive role in implementing bicycle facilities.

Bicyclists are subject to rules of the road as enforced by police agencies. Two-thirds of reported accidents involving bicyclists in Multnomah County from 1983-1988 were the fault of the bicyclists. Bicycle safety education programs and greater traffic enforcement of bicyclists may substantially reduce future bicycle accident rates. The sense of competition between cyclists and motorists on public roads is not improved by lack of awareness by motorists to the needs and rights of cyclists.

The Bicycle Master Plan coordinates continued development of a safe and efficient road and bicycle system. Having a bicycle-friendly bikeway infrastructure will improve the bicycling environment. The Plan identifies several education and information opportunities to further promote compatibility between cyclist and motorists. The aim is to reduce the rate and severity of bicycle-related accidents on Multnomah County roads, and encourage greater bicycle use.

BACKGROUND

Multnomah County addressed the needs of the bicycling public in 1978 by adopting policies within the Comprehensive Framework Plan specifying preparation of a County bicycle plan.

The Bicycle Corridor Concept Plan was prepared and adopted along with an ordinance directing implementation of the proposed routes. This Plan included:

1. Corridors for future bike routes.
2. Recreation routes linking scenic areas and parks.
3. Utilitarian (street) routes that were planned in conjunction with road projects.

Mechanisms to assess route safety, define route alternatives and build facilities were not well defined at this time. However, one major bike path and one bike route were implemented under this plan.

The Framework Plan was substantially revised in 1982 to satisfy State Land Conservation and Development Commission standards. The Bicycle/Pedestrian section of the Physical Support chapter was prepared in response to the transportation goal, within the Statewide Planning Goals. A Bikeways Plan map was adopted that identified future bike routes on County road rights-of-way. A bicycle/pedestrian policy was also adopted specifying:

1. Street improvement projects on roads designated for bikeways shall be constructed to accommodate bicyclists, based on AASHTO bicycle guidelines.
2. A bicycle capital improvement program shall be adopted that prioritized the use of limited Bicycle Fund monies.
3. Various implementation strategies were identified including land and road development projects.
4. Participation in the Metro regional bicycle planning process.
5. Promotion of bicycle travel, and provision of public bicycling information.

ENVISION THE FUTURE

Since 1978 Multnomah County has developed:

- 4.9 miles of shared bikeways
- 10.8 miles of bike lanes
- 2.0 miles of bike paths
- 17.7 Total miles of bikeways

In addition, many rural roads have been widened 4 additional feet to provide for improved lane sharing. Much of the County's portion of the 40-Mile Loop has been developed.

The 1990 Transportation Capital Improvement Program (CIP) lists over 14 miles of road improvements to be developed by 1995 that include bicycle facilities.

Much of the 133 miles of unbuilt bikeways will be provided as roads are reconstructed to urban standards, through the road capital improvement process. The most vital bikeways, needing to be constructed sooner than scheduled in the Road CIP, will be provided through the Bicycle Capital Improvement Program. Rural roads will be upgraded whenever possible with paved shoulders as repaving occurs. Finally, urban roads already built curb-to-curb can be signed and striped for bikeways relatively easily and without major capital costs.

The end result of the Bicycle Master Plan, after the bicycle system is built out and its policies implemented, will be an infrastructure that adequately accommodates the needs of bicyclists within the integrated and balanced transportation system. Population and economic growth will lead to additional bicycle travel. Developing bikeways and generally making County urban and rural roads safer for motorists and bicyclists to share will add to the comfort level of bicycling. Development of bike paths and completion of the 40 Mile Loop will further promote the growth of bicycling as a means of transportation and recreation.

Area residents and visitors will enjoy easy bicycle access to recreation resources such as the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area. Increased cost of motor travel will eventually lead to non-motorized travel for certain types of trips. Recreation needs of an urban population will attract bicyclists to rural areas of Multnomah County. An extensive off-road bicycle/pedestrian system will be in demand. The bicycle will continue to be a means of independent transportation for children, and adults will increasingly use bicycles for recreation and utilitarian trips. Bicycling will be a popular family activity.

PLANNING PROCESS

The Bicycle Master Plan is a component of the Multnomah County Master Transportation Plan and the Multnomah County Comprehensive Framework Plan. Local governments are required by the State of Oregon (ORS 197.175) to perform planning that interrelates land use and transportation, with the natural and human environments, and public infrastructure. Public involvement in the planning process is State mandated, as well as Plan adoption following hearings by the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners.

The Bicycle Master Plan includes objectives and policies that are consistent with the adopted County Comprehensive Framework Plan.

Providing a bicycle transportation system that serves residents and visitors, connecting homes to schools, work, shopping, and recreation destinations is consistent with County Policy 33a (Comprehensive Framework Plan) of providing a balanced, safe and efficient transportation system.

Implementation strategies are identified as opportunities to direct County resources towards achievable objectives, and satisfy public needs.

A bicycle capital improvement program will be prepared as a means to implement the Bicycle Master Plan. Potential bicycle capital projects will be evaluated as to their relative value to the community based upon criteria of need. Other opportunities to provide a safe bicycling environment are investigated in the Plan with implementation strategies identified regarding education, enforcement and infrastructure improvements.



Multnomah County Transportation Division undertook in 1989 to update the bicycle portion of the 1982 Comprehensive Framework Plan. The Countywide Bicycle Planning Task Force was formed of concerned citizens to assist in preparing the plan and making recommendations. A representative Sauvie Island Task Force was formed to address the specific needs of bicyclists and residents on Sauvie Island. These citizens in their advisory role provided vital community input to the planning process. Objectives, policies, routes, and strategies were reviewed and revised leading to the recommended Bicycle Master Plan.

The recommended Bicycle Master Plan underwent extensive public review and comment. The revised Bicycle Master Plan was submitted to the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners for public hearing and action on _____, 1990. The Board of Commissioners on _____ (adopted the Bicycle Master Plan by ordinance).

Input from the following local, regional and State governmental agencies was sought to assure that a coordinated countywide bicycle network will result.

City of Fairview
City of Gresham
City of Lake Oswego
City of Portland
City of Troutdale
City of Wood Village
Clackamas County
Washington County
Metropolitan Service District
Mt. Hood National Forest
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Columbia River Gorge Commission
Multnomah County Parks Services Division
Multnomah County Planning and Development Division
Multnomah County Sheriff's Office

AMENDING THE PLAN

Changes will occur in Multnomah County's demographics, transportation system and land uses patterns. These changes will need to be reflected in future Bicycle Master Plan revisions.

The Bicycle Master Plan is scheduled for revision every five years, coinciding with the update of the Multnomah County Transportation Plan. The Bicycle Capital Improvement Plan is scheduled for revision every two years.

The Bicycle Master Plan may also need to be amended if significant changes in the County occur such as new roads, major land or recreational developments or major government policy changes.

Recommended policy and plan map amendments to the Bicycle Master Plan shall be presented to the Planning Commission and Board of Commissioners for adoption, following public review. The Multnomah County Comprehensive Framework Plan may need to be amended to reflect bicycle policy and plan map changes, in accordance with County and State comprehensive plan amendment procedures.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of the Bicycle Master Plan includes Multnomah County roads, bridges, and bikeways only. Excluded from bicycle planning are roads and bikeways belonging to cities or the State of Oregon, private roads and dedicated streets, and any other land not accepted as County rights-of-way.

Multnomah County roads are located in the following areas:

- Sauvie Island and rural west county
- Urban east county, outside of the City of Portland.
- The following Willamette River bridges:
 1. Sellwood Bridge
 2. Hawthorne Bridge
 3. Morrison Bridge
 4. Burnside Bridge
 5. Broadway Bridge.
 6. Sauvie Island
- Rural east County
- Several westside unincorporated pockets.

**OBJECTIVES
POLICIES
PROGRAM
IMPLEMENTATION
AND
FUNDING**

OBJECTIVE #1 Develop and maintain an extensive network of bicycle transportation facilities that provide safe, efficient, and enjoyable bicycle travel.

POLICIES A: FACILITIES

Provide bicycle facilities that accommodate the various needs of the bicycling public.

1. Bicycles shall be an integral component of the balanced and integrated County transportation system such that Multnomah County roads and bridges shall be made safe and accessible to bicyclists.
2. A comprehensive and connected network of bikeway facilities shall be designated for ultimate development in the adopted Bikeway Plan map.

B. FUNDING:

Systematically budget and program County Bicycle Funds, based upon criteria of need, through a periodically revised and approved bicycle capital improvement plan and program; seek supplemental funds from a variety of other potential revenue sources.

C. DEVELOPMENT:

Continue to develop new or improved County bikeway facilities and bicycle-friendly streets and roads, in a systematic and programmed manner.

D. HAZARDS:

Enable safe bicycle use of County bikeways through timely maintenance, and through remedies to avoidable hazards and conflicts.

E. PARTICIPATION:

Actively seek public participation in County bicycle planning and development processes; continue to coordinate with other public agencies and the private sector in planning and providing for the bicycling public.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES:

1. Adopt by reference and implement Oregon Department of Transportation and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) bicycle standards or guidelines concerning design, construction and maintenance of bikeway facilities.
2. To the greatest extent possible, County roads shall be made safe, bicycle-friendly facilities through design and construction practices, and maintenance and traffic control procedures.
3. Identify opportunities and develop implementation means to provide bikeways outside of public road rights-of-way. Such potential future bikeways facilities as: utility corridors, greenways, railroad rights-of-way, levees and dikes, public and private land develop, and joint development projects are incorporated by reference in the Bikeway Plan map.
4. Promote greater use of intermodal trips in the region with the acquisition or refitting, by transit authorities, of transit vehicles to accommodate bicycles.

1. Multnomah County road and bikeway improvement plans and programs shall fund the design and construction of bicycle facilities through biannual capital budget processes that:
 - List and prioritize possible bikeway projects in relation to criteria of greatest need.
 - Schedule capital expenditures in relation to actual income.
 - Implement projects on an annual basis.
 - Is revised and adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, following public review, on a biannual basis.
2. Discover and capture supplemental bicycle revenue and contributions to fund bicycle safety programs, and provide for bikeways outside of public road rights-of-way. Potential sources of funds and services may include:
 - Other governmental agencies.
 - Private donations, and contributions of materials or services.
 - Joint public/private projects.
 - Grants and other sources unknown.

1. Take advantage of opportunities to add to the County inventory of bikeways:
 - As new roads and bridges are developed.
 - As existing roads and bridges are reconstructed or upgraded.
 - As road and bridge maintenance programs are implemented, such as the County Pavement Management System.
 - In cooperation with the private sector through the land development permit and right-of-way permit processes.
 - By constructing bikeway capital projects through the Bicycle Capital Improvement Plan and Program.
 - Through joint projects with public agencies and the private sector.
2. Encourage or require through County permitting authority, secure and convenient, weather-protected bicycle parking and storage facilities as new development or redevelop occurs.

1. Provide a relatively high level of regular scheduled maintenance of County urban and rural bikeways, including sweeping, mowing, pavement repair and drainage, that is sensitive to the particular needs of bicyclists.
2. Respond promptly to reports by the public and others, of potentially unsafe conditions for bicyclists on County roads and bikeways.
3. Implement traffic management solutions to bicycling hazards, and mitigate conflicts between bicyclists and other users of County rights-of-way.

1. Seek ongoing public input and involvement in revising the Bicycle Master Plan and Capital Improvement Plan, and addressing other bicycling needs and concerns.
 - Establish and staff a countywide citizen bicycle advisory committee to address current and future bicycling problems and opportunities.
 - Provide timely response to public inquiries for bicycling information by publishing and distributing informational and educational materials regarding bicycle safety and bicycling opportunities.
 - Cooperate with other government agencies in providing bicycling information.
 - Coordinate the Multnomah County bicycle system and program with other local, regional, State and federal governments in providing a comprehensive bicycle network and a safe, enjoyable bicycling environment.

OBJECTIVE #2 Increase bicyclist and motorist knowledge and awareness so as to resolve hazards and conflicts of bicycling and reduce the occurrence of bicycle related accidents.

POLICIES: A. AWARENESS

Increase public awareness of bicycling opportunities and benefits, rules of the road, and safe riding skills by providing and distributing public bicycle information materials.

IMPLEMENTATION

STRATEGIES:

1. Revise the County bicycle information brochure as needed to provide current bicycling information.
2. Participate with other organizations in providing public bicycling information.
3. Provide adequate identification and traffic control signage on County bikeways so as to:
 - Alert bicyclists and motorists to the presence of designated bikeways.
 - Alert motorists of the bicycle rights of way and require motorists to yield when appropriate.

B. SAFETY

Support various organizations, and seek sources of funding and cooperation in providing bicycle safety education and training.

1. Promote bicycle safety education and training through various channels including:
 - Multnomah County Sheriffs other police agencies, and courts.
 - Schools and Educational Service District (ESD).
 - Service organizations and bike clubs.
 - Private enterprises.
 - County community service agencies and vendors.
2. Seek sources of funding and support to provide bicycle safety education and training.

C. ENFORCEMENT

Encourage and facilitate a greater level of enforcement of vehicle laws so as to reduce the occurrence of bicycle/motor vehicle conflicts, and the rate of bicycle-related accidents.

1. Work with the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office and other police agencies to:
 - Educate officers of the need to enforce lawful operation of bicycles.
 - Provide bicycle safety education.
 - Seek to reduce the number of bicycle-related accidents where the bicyclist is at fault.
 - Alert motorists of the rights of bicyclists on County roads.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

With the adoption of the Bicycle Master Plan, the process of achieving or implementing plan proposals and policies begins. Various opportunities and programs exist by which to further this implementation process. The following is a list of actions that will help to realize the bikeway plan through the Transportation Division Strategic Plan.

1. Construction of bikeway projects can begin based upon the bicycle capital improvement project schedule.
2. Existing streets that are 1) built curb-to-curb to urban standards, and 2) designated for a bikeway on the Bikeway Plan Map can be signed and striped for the type of bikeway facility appropriate to each street.
3. A higher level of bikeway maintenance can be identified as a County maintenance objective resulting in a more extensive and frequent mowing and sweeping program.
4. Culverts, foglines, and other road appurtenances can be modified to create a more bicycle-friendly environment.
5. Construction of bikeways as designated on the Bikeways Plan Map can occur as roads are constructed or reconstructed through the Transportation Capital Improvement Program.
6. Rural roads, where limited site distances or other hazards create potential conflicts between motorists and bicyclists, can be identified and shoulder bikeways paved to reduce conflicts and improve road safety.
7. Wider rural roads can also be implemented as part of the County pavement management system as roads are scheduled for repaving.
8. The County-published "Peddler's Pamphlet" can be revised with revised bicycling information.
9. Opportunities to provide mountain bike paths or trails such as unused County rights-of-way can be investigated as to their implementation feasibility.

PROGRAM FUNDING

10. The availability of bicycle-sensitive traffic control hardware should be assessed as well as the cost and process to install such hardware on bikeways.
11. Create a county-wide citizen committee to advise Multnomah County on bicycle problems and opportunities.
12. Work with various agencies, organizations and businesses to sponsor and provide bicycle safety training and education.
13. Continue to work with other local, regional and State governments, and the 40 Mile Loop Land Trust to coordinate bikeway planning and development efforts.
14. Incorporate standards and provisions for bicycle storage and parking within the County zoning ordinance.
15. Work with public transit providers to facilitate the intermodal combination of bicycling and bus or train trips, with the addition of bicycle parking facilities at transit stops and the allowance of bicycles on transit vehicles.


Multnomah County bicycle funds are presently limited to State-collected gas tax monies in the Oregon Highway Trust Fund that are returned to the County. One percent of the gas tax monies retained by the County are dedicated to design, construction and maintenance of pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The remaining portion of the County gas tax monies are used for developing and maintaining other County transportation facilities, such as roads and bridges.

Gas tax monies are a reasonably secure source of revenue, but with spending restrictions. The level of income is relatively small in relation to the need for additional bikeways in Multnomah County. As bikeways continue to be developed by the County, available revenue for capital projects will decrease in relation to the increased cost to maintain the expanding system.

Another constraint to use of gas tax money for bikeways is the requirement to spend the money only within road rights-of-way. It is difficult for the County to develop and maintain 40-Mile Loop and mountain bike paths that are not within road rights-of-way, for example. This condition leaves future implementation of the Columbia/Sandy River and Johnson Creek 40-Mile Loop bike paths in questions. Funding for bicycle education programs is also uncertain given existing spending parameters.

One objective of the Funding Policy and Implementation Strategy of the Plan is to seek additional funds to supplement existing revenue sources, and to leverage available money to the greatest extent possible. Additional resources may be available within the County or through other governmental agencies. The private sector can be instrumental in the development of bikeways through land dedication, within development projects, and other creative possibilities such as joint development projects.

The intent of the funding proposal is to use gas tax revenue for bike projects within County rights-of-way, and seek additional, less restricted resources for the other necessary, or desirable bicycle facilities and services.



**FACILITY CLASSIFICATION
SYSTEM**

Bikeways on Multnomah County roads can be classified into five types of facilities depending on traffic characteristics, street geometry, and level and type of bicycle usage. Unless bicyclists are prohibited by law from using a street or bridge, all Multnomah County streets are part of the bicycle network. Bikeway classifications on County roads include:

Bike paths are exclusive bicycle facilities that are physically separated from roads and motor vehicles. Bike paths provide excellent recreational and family riding having limited conflicts with motor vehicles.

Bike lanes are preferential or exclusive bicycle facilities, signed and striped within the roadway to provide separate bicycle and motor vehicle travel lanes. Bike lanes are preferred where traffic volumes or speeds are relatively high, and provide the urban bicycle network between neighborhoods and communities.

Lane-Sharing Bikeways are signed facilities that share the roadway with motor vehicles, usually on low volume and low speed urban streets. Lane-sharing bikeways connect neighborhoods to bike lane within the bikeway hierarchy.

Shoulder bikeways are provided on rural roads by widening and paving road shoulders. Shoulder bikeways offer added road width to better accommodate bicycle travel outside of motor vehicle travel lanes.

Shared Roadways are County roads where bikes share the road and right-of-way with other vehicles.

Development of bikeways can occur in several ways:


1. Streets that are built to urban standards can have the appropriate type of bicycle facility added to the roadway based on criteria as described on Page 26.
2. Existing substandard streets can be reconstructed to urban standards with bikeways if the street has been designated on the Bikeway Plan Map.
3. Entirely new streets may be developed. Bikeways can be included based on projected use.
4. Upgrading an existing bikeway, from a shared roadway to a lane-sharing bikeway for example can occur as conditions change, such as higher vehicle speeds or greater traffic volumes.

The bikeway classification system distinguishes urban from rural facilities, and is closely related to road functional classifications, i.e., collector or arterial streets. The following upgraded bikeway descriptions relate to:

- A) Roads already built to standards;
and
- B) Roads to be built or reconstructed at a future date. General criteria are listed to guide the determination of bikeway type, however specialized or unique conditions may also affect the determination.

Upgrading a shared roadway to a lane-sharing bikeway provides greater awareness of bicyclists using the road, and offers bicyclists the use of the developed bicycle network to arrive at their destination. Prevailing traffic speeds should remain below 35 mph, with average daily traffic should be below 5000 vehicles. Minimum width of the shared lane should be 12 feet.

Lane-shared bikeways may be upgraded to bike lanes if prevailing traffic speeds exceed 35 MPH, or where traffic volumes or bicycle-related accidents warrant the addition of bike lanes.



BIKEWAY FACILITIES ON COUNTY ROADS BUILT TO STANDARDS

	Bike Use	Travel Lanes	Median Lanes	Bike Lanes	Turn Lanes	Parking Lanes	Pavement	ROW	Average Daily Traffic @ Speed (MPH)	Shoulder	Bikeway Signing	Bikeway Striping	Notes
URBAN Locals													
Residential	A. Shared Road Lane-Share	1-16' 1-16'				2-8' 2-8'	32' 32'	50' 50'	< 1000 @ 25 < 1000 @ 25		Yes		
	B. Shared Road	1-12'				2-8'	28'	50'	< 1000 @ 25				Parking May Be One Side Only
Commercial	A. Shared Road	2-10'				2-8'	36'	50'	< 1000 @ 25				
	B. Shared Road Lane-Share	2-12' 2-12'				2-10' 2-10'	44' 44'	60' 60'	< 1000 @ 25 < 1000 @ 25		Yes		High Truck Volume High Truck Volume
Industrial	A. Shared Road Lane-Share	2-11' 2-11'				2-8' 2-8'	38' 38'	50' 50'	< 1000 @ 25 < 1000 @ 25		Yes		
	B. Shared Road Lane-Share	2-12' 2-12'				2-10' 2-10'	44' 44'	60' 60'	< 1000 @ 25 < 1000 @ 25		Yes		Large Truck Use Large Truck Use
Collectors													
Neighborhood	A. Shared Road Lane-Share	2-11' 2-11'				2-8' 2-8'	38' 38'	50' 50'	1-4000 @ 30 1-4000 @ 30		Yes		
Major	A. Shared Road	2-12'				2-10'	44'	60'	4-13,000 @ 30				
	B. Bike Lanes	2-11'		2-5'	1-12'		44'	60'	4-13,000 @ 30		Yes	Yes	No Parking
Arterials													
Minor	A. Shared Road	2-12' & 2-14'	1-14'				66'	80'	13-20,000 @ 35-40				No Parking, Res./Comm. Mix
	B. Bike Lanes	4-11'	1-12'	2-5'			66'	80'	13-20,000 @ 35-40		Yes	Yes	No Parking
	C. Shared Road	2-12' & 2-13'			1-12'	2-8'	66'	80'	13-20,000 @ 35-40				
	D. Shared Road	4-11'	1-12'			2-8'	72'	90'	13-20,000 @ 35-40				W/Turn Lanes
Major/ Principle	A. Shared Road	2-12' & 2-14'	1-14'				66'	80'	20-30,000 @ 35-45				High Volume, No Parking
	B. Bike Lanes	4-12'	1-14'	2-5'			72'	90'	20-30,000 @ 35-45		Yes	Yes	High Volume, No Parking
	C. Shared Road	4-12'	1-14'			2-8'	78'	100'	20-30,000 @ 35-45				High Volume, W/Parking
RURAL													
Locals	Shared Road	2-12'					24'	50'		2-4' Gravel			
Collectors	Shldr Bikeway	2-12'					32'	60'		2-8' Paved			

BIKEWAY PLAN MAPS


Bikeway Plan Maps designate routes that will ultimately be developed to standards that provide for bicycle travel. Adopted bikeway routes are shown on five Bikeway Plan Maps representing County jurisdiction in the following areas:

1. Southwest Unincorporated Areas
2. Westside Unincorporated Areas
3. Willamette River Bridges
4. Northwest County: Tualatin Hills and Sauvie Island
5. East County: Urban, Rural and Columbia River Gorge

Northwest and East County Bikeway Plan Maps are included separately.


Routes not designated but adopted by reference include: unused County rights-of-way as potential mountain bike trails, future abandoned railroad rights-of-way, utility corridors, levees, dikes, and greenways.

The 1990 Bikeway Plan Maps represent the comprehensive County bicycle network as planned. The designated facilities are to be preserved and improved over time to better accommodate bicycling. No warranty or guarantee is made, at this time, as to the suitability of the roadway condition or fitness of the route for bicycling. Modifications to the system will be made as conditions warrant.










MULTNOMAH COUNTY
GUIDE TO 1990 BIKEWAY PLAN MAPS



SCALE: 1" = 3 MILES






MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

1990 BIKEWAYS PLAN MAP


SOUTHWEST POCKETS




0 2000

6/90

The 1990 Bikeway Plan Maps represent the comprehensive County bicycle network as planned. The designated facilities are to be preserved and improved over time to better accommodate bicycling. No warranty or guarantee is made, at this time, as to the suitability of the roadway condition or fitness of the route for bicycling. Modifications to the system will be made as conditions warrant.




The 1990 Bikeway Plan Maps represent the comprehensive County bicycle network as planned. The designated facilities are to be preserved and improved over time to better accommodate bicycling. No warranty or guarantee is made, at this time, as to the suitability of the roadway condition or fitness of the route for bicycling. Modifications to the system will be made as conditions warrant.



MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON


1990 BIKEWAYS PLAN MAP WESTSIDE POCKETS

Planned Bikeways




0 2000'

6/90



MULTNOMAH COUNTY
 DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
 TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
 1620 S.E. 190th Ave. PORTLAND, ORE.
 1990 BICYCLE MASTER PLAN
 1990 BIKEWAY PLAN
 NORTHWEST MULTNOMAH COUNTY
 SCALE: 1" = 3000'




LEGEND

	MULTNOMAH COUNTY	OTHER JURISDICTIONS
Plan Bikeways		
1990 Additions		


The 1990 Bikeway Plan Maps represent the comprehensive County bicycle network as planned. The designated facilities are to be preserved and improved over time to better accommodate bicycling. No warranty or guarantee is made, at this time, as to the suitability of the roadway condition or fitness of the route for bicycling. Modifications to the system will be made as conditions warrant.

The 1990 Bikeway Plan Maps represent the comprehensive County bicycle network as planned. The designated facilities are to be preserved and improved over time to better accommodate bicycling. No warranty or guarantee is made, at this time, as to the suitability of the roadway condition or fitness of the route for bicycling. Modifications to the system will be made as conditions warrant.

MULTNOMAH COUNTY
 DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
 TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
 1620 S.E. 190th Ave. PORTLAND, ORE.
 1990 BICYCLE MASTER PLAN
 1990 BIKEWAY PLAN
 EAST COUNTY URBAN
 SCALE: 1" = 3000'



LEGEND
 MULTNOMAH COUNTY OTHER JURISDICTIONS
 PLAN BIKEWAYS
 1990 ADDITIONS



MULTNOMAH COUNTY
 CLACKAMAS COUNTY

**BICYCLE HAZARDS
AND PROBLEMS
BIKEWAY DESIGN
AND
MAINTENANCE GUIDELINES**

The following section of road design, engineering and maintenance guidelines illustrates ways the County could implement the bikeway system. For specific bikeway guidelines and standards, reference must be made to the current American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials bicycle guidelines; State of Oregon: Bicycle Master Plan and amendments; Federal Highway Administration: Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices; and the Illuminating Engineering Society: IES Lighting Handbook.

BICYCLE HAZARDS AND PROBLEMS

Bicyclists are considered by the State of Oregon to be legitimate users of public roads and have the same rights and duties as drivers of motor vehicles. Bicyclists are required to obey all rules of the road as apply to motor vehicles, except regulations which specifically exclude bicycles. County roads not specifically prohibited to bicyclists can, and probably will be used for bicycling. Multnomah County is pursuing a policy of providing an extensive connected network of designated bikeways and a bicycle-friendly road system.

Bicycles often require roadway design, engineering and maintenance practices that directly apply to the needs and characteristics of this non-motorized means of travel. This section describes some of the hazards and problems that maybe encountered by bicyclists.

Lane Sharing:

Where outside travel lanes are 12 foot wide or wider, motor vehicles exercising reasonable caution when overtaking a bicyclist should be able to "share the lane" and pass without crossing into the opposing traffic lane. However, the passing vehicle will often cross into the opposing lane and even delay the passing maneuver until it can be safely executed. With lane sharing, higher speeds and large vehicles, i.e., trucks add to the risk of the bicyclist, especially on narrower roads or where no paved shoulder exists.

Roads with uphill grades result in bicycles traveling at slower speeds while climbing. Overtaking motor vehicles would necessarily need to reduce speed until it is safe to execute the passing maneuver. Also where sight distance is impaired, overtaking motorists must follow bicyclists until it is safe to pass if the opposing lane is used to execute the pass.

Additional lane width or paved shoulders would be beneficial on uphill lanes and where sight distance is impaired. Sharing of the travel lane would be facilitated, and delays between bicyclists and motorists reduced.

On roadways with outside lanes less than 12 feet wide and without paved shoulders, overtaking traffic must use the opposing traffic lane to safely pass the bicyclist. Experienced bicyclists will realize that the lane is too narrow to effectively share with the motorist, and therefore will "take the lane."

In this manner, the unsafe situation of sharing a lane of substandard width is avoided. The unspoken message is sent to the overtaking motorist to pass using the opposing lane when it is safe to do so. Motorists unfamiliar with bicyclist behavior may not understand this maneuver, or resent the delay. Informing and educating motorists is an important component of the Bicycle Program to explain such situations as lane sharing.

Substandard lane widths of less than 12 feet should be remedied:

1. On uphill grades
2. Where sight distance is impaired
3. On shared bikeways
4. On rural County roads

Shoulder Bikeways:

Roads with paved shoulders can be quite useful for bicycle travel. There are several factors that need to be considered when designing shoulder bikeways.

1. Bicycles typically have narrow, high pressure tires that affect cyclists' balance and stability on irregular surfaces. Rural roads can best accommodate bicyclists if they have a smooth all-weather, paved shoulder. A clean and smooth shoulder can provide a rural bicycle facility, separated from motorized traffic, that is safer than shared lanes. Paved shoulders will result in more predictable bicycle travel and less congestion between motorist and bicyclist, by placing bicycles in a separate travel lane.
2. Bicycles are subject to lateral aerodynamic forces caused by large motor vehicles such as trucks, buses, and recreational vehicles. The effect of air turbulence increases with increased speed of the motor vehicle and decreased distance between the two vehicles.

On roads with substantial truck or bus traffic, and particularly roads where the prevailing speed of motor vehicles is greater than 45 MPH, precautions should be taken to reduce the hazard and risk of accidents to bicyclists from lateral aerodynamic forces.

3. Regardless of the width of shoulder bikeway, the outside edge is seldom used by bicyclists. Along this edge there may be drainage problems, intrusion by vegetation, debris not swept off or blown off by motor vehicles, and raveling of pavement edges. The effective width of the shoulder bikeway is therefore reduced.

The riding style and confidence level of the bicyclist, and traffic conditions (speed and volume) will determine where the bicyclist will ride within the effective width of the shoulder bikeway. As a general principle, bicyclists will ride further to the right as traffic volumes and traffic speeds increase.

Road Hazards:

Road conditions that are usually not hazardous to motorists, present special problems to bicyclists. Potential road hazards to bicycles should be considered during road design and construction, and in road maintenance procedures. The following is a list of bicycle road hazards and problems that the County can affect:

- a. Drainage grate inlets can pose a hazard to bicycle travel. Multnomah County has sought to eliminate all drainage grate conditions that trap the bicycle wheel and cause the bicyclist to lose control. However when wet, drainage grates become slippery and can cause the bicyclist to lose control. Bicyclists tend to steer away from drainage grates to avoid this hazard. By steering left, the bicyclist may encounter another hazard from overtaking vehicles.

One remedy would have drainage grates located outside of bicycle travel lanes. A drainage facility used recently by the County sits inside and flush with the curb and thus eliminates this bicycle hazard.

b. Upon new construction, reconstruction or resurfacing, in-road fixtures such as utility covers and drainage grates need to be adjusted so that they are flush with the finish grade rather than sunken below or projecting above grade.

c. Raised roadway reflectors provide valuable safety benefits to motorists. However, "buttons" are a surface irregularity that can pose a hazard to bicyclists. This is especially true when the reflectors are placed in or near bicycle travel lanes where they may deflect the bicycle into the traffic lane. If no other alternative is available, reflectors need to be installed outside of the bikeway and have a beveled front edge.

d. Extruded curbs, when used as a barrier between motorist and bicyclist, can be a hazard to both. Extruded curbs also cause debris to collect inside the bikeway, and are a maintenance problem when sweeping or overlaying the roadway.

Extruded curbs should not be used to delineate bikeways. If a physical barrier is necessary, 32" G.M.-type concrete barriers are superior since they provide safety advantages and discourage accumulation of debris.

e. Sand, gravel, glass, and other debris in the bicycle travel lane is hazardous to bicycling. Regular sweeping of the bikeway can control the accumulation of debris, but cannot eliminate the problem. Debris is often drawn onto the pavement from adjacent unpaved streets, driveways, parking areas, and farming operations. An effective solution to this problem is to pave an apron or approach to the roadway from unpaved areas. This practice will lessen the need for debris removal on the bikeway.

Intersections:

Bicyclists are subject to the same means of traffic control as motorists. For bicyclists to properly obey traffic control devices such as traffic lights, these devices must be selected and installed to accommodate bicycles as well as motor vehicles.

Traffic control devices should be placed so they can be seen by bicyclists who are correctly positioned on the roadway. If the signal is unable to detect a bicycle, the bicyclist may opt to proceed through the intersection against the light. Detectors for traffic-activated signals may need to be placed in the bicycle travel lane and capable of detecting bicycles. Push button signal activators, placed to be visible and accessible to the bicyclist, can remedy this problem.

Bicycle lanes often begin or end short of the intersection. This alignment does not provide necessary traffic control for motorists and bicyclists. Congestion may result, particularly if the motorist or bicyclist is inexperienced with this situation. One notable problem is the routing of bicyclists through an intersection while motorists seek to turn right correctly from the right-hand lane. Traffic solutions that have been successfully implemented in other communities should be evaluated with the objective of providing a more comprehensive bicycle network and reducing congestion.



Railroad Crossings:

Railroad crossings are particularly hazardous situations to bicyclists. The problem is aggravated by diagonal crossings and frequent wet, rainy conditions. Slippery railroad crossings, irregular surfaces, and the chance that the bicycle wheel will be caught in the rail flangeway could each lead to loss of control. Several engineering and design solutions are available to mitigate these problems, and should be used where bikeways intersect with railroad crossings.

Road Maintenance Needs:

Bicycling safety can be compromised by inadequate maintenance. A safe road surface is essential for a pleasurable riding experience. Potholes, bumps, seams, and debris can have a minor impact on motor vehicles. However, these conditions can cause loss of control of the bicycle, or conflicts with motorists as the bicyclist avoids these hazards.

Bicycles require a higher standard of road maintenance than motor vehicles. Bicycle travel lanes need to be maintained free of potholes, bumps, corrugations, seams, fragmented pavement edges, gravel, glass, vegetation, and other debris or obstacles that detract from a smooth and safe riding surface.

Maintenance of road facilities frequented by bicyclists does not require changes in the type of maintenance activities that occur. Instead, road maintenance in these situations needs to focus on the particular and unique needs of bicyclists.

BIKEWAY DESIGN AND MAINTENANCE GUIDELINES

LANE SHARING ROADS

A shared roadway should safely accommodate both motor vehicles and bicycles, and is a reasonable bicycle facility for most County roads. Lane sharing occurs where bike lanes or paved shoulders are not available to the bicyclist.


Sufficient lane width along with traffic volumes and speeds are important variables in developing shared roadways. The objective is for motorists and bicyclists to each use the shared roadway without unduly compromising the other's level of service and safety.

The optimum width of the shared lane is 14 feet which allows bicyclists and motorists to operate side-by-side. Lanes wider than 14 feet would encourage motorists to travel two abreast. Lane width on shared roadways is based on usable pavement width and is measured from lane strip to pavement edge line excluding curbs, gutters or raveled pavement edges.


Minimum lane width of a shared roadway should be 12 feet which is most appropriate where traffic volumes and speeds are relatively low. On uphill slopes greater than 5%, where sight distance is impaired, or where traffic volumes exceed 4,000 vehicles daily, additional lane width is needed for added safety.

Lane sharing should not be encouraged on roads having heavy usage by large vehicles such as trucks or buses, or where the prevailing traffic speed is greater than 45 MPH. In such cases, shoulder bikeways, bike lanes or alternate bikeway routes should be considered.

LOCAL 28 FOOT STREET




LOCAL 32 FOOT STREET



Multnomah County has developed arterial and collector streets with 8 to 10 foot parking lanes that are often used by bicyclists. However, a bicyclist, when passing a parked car may enter into the adjacent travel lane – possibly into the path of an overtaking vehicle. This problem is most acute where the outside travel lane is less than 12 feet wide, or the parking lane is only 8 feet wide.

Where no alternate bikeway route is available, outside lanes on arterial streets should be 12 feet wide. This added width will promote safer lane sharing on arterial streets, especially where traffic volumes are relatively high. Parking should be prohibited on arterial streets with bike lanes.



SHOULDER BIKEWAYS

The rural road bikeway standard is to add paved shoulders wherever possible. Rural collector roads are specified as having two 4 foot wide paved shoulders. Shoulder bikeways should be a minimum 4 feet wide, 6 feet is preferred.

Paved shoulders significantly reduce risks to bicyclists and motorists on rural roads, and where grades are greater than 5% or where sight distance is impaired. To create a safer, more bicycle-friendly rural bicycle system, shoulders should be added as a priority on roads with steep slopes and poor visibility.

Paved shoulders have added benefits: as travel lanes for farm equipment, lower road maintenance costs than gravel shoulders, and safer roadways for motorists and other users of the right-of-way (school buses, mail delivery, and pedestrians). A policy of adding paved shoulders on rural local and collector roads should be considered wherever it is cost-effective or significantly improves safety. Paved shoulders not only provides safer rural bikeways, but has the added benefit of a more accommodating roadway for a wide variety of users.


BIKE LANE WIDTH AND PLACEMENT

The objective of bicycle lanes is to provide a clear riding zone of 4 feet minimum width for the exclusive use of bicyclists. Parking is not allowed in bike lanes per State law.

Bike lanes on County roads should always be one-way facilities, traveling with the flow of traffic and located on the right side of the road. The exception is one-way streets where the bike lane may be located on either side of the street.


Minimum 5 foot wide bike lanes can be placed between parking lanes and traffic lanes. It is much safer however, to design streets without parking adjacent to bike lanes because of limited visibility, and the threat of car doors suddenly opening into the bike lane.

SHOULDER BIKEWAY



A one foot shy distance is necessary between the clear riding zone and obstructions, although 2 feet is preferred.

AASHTO bicycle guidelines specify a minimum bike lane width of 4 feet, measured from edge of pavement or other outboard constraint. The State of Oregon Bicycle Master Plan specifies a preference for 6 foot bike lanes.



In no case should there be constrictions within bicycle lanes (narrower pavement width, power poles, guardrails, or longitudinal cracks) that reduces the effective bike lane width below 4 feet.

The standard County bike lane width is 5 feet. This does not include the one foot shy distance. Four feet should only be used when some physical or other constraint prohibits developing

a standard 5 foot bike lane. In this case, other alternatives should be considered to provide standard bike lanes including:

- Reduce lane widths
- Relocating the centerline
- Route bike paths around obstructions

Bicycle lanes should be 6 feet wide when prevailing motor vehicle speeds are greater than 45 MPH, and:

- a. Five percent or more of average daily traffic is composed of trucks, buses or other large vehicles, or
- b. More than 20 large vehicles travel on the road during any one hour.

Bike lanes wider than 6 feet are not recommended as they may be mistaken for a motor vehicle lane. Where right or left turn only lanes are designated for motor vehicles, AASHTO bicycle guidelines should be followed:

"At intersections, bicyclists proceeding straight through and motorists turning right must cross paths. Striping and signing configurations which encourage these crossings in advance of the intersection, in a merging fashion, are generally preferable to those that force the crossing in the immediate area of the intersection."

Guide for the Development of New Bicycle Facilities, 1981.

BIKE PATH WIDTH AND PLACEMENT

Bike paths are preferential bicycle corridors that exclude motor vehicles and have few street crossings.

One-way bike paths are not recommended as they will invariably be used for two-way travel. The exception may be bridges where the only recourse to accommodate bicycles is one-way bike paths. Regulatory signing is vital in this case.


Bike paths should be physically separated from motor traffic by a minimum 5 foot open space, or a substantial barrier of 4.5 feet or greater height.

The desired minimum width of a two-way bicycle path is 10 feet. A minimum two foot graded shy distance on both sides of the bike path is required. A shy distance of 3 feet is preferred to provide additional clearance from obstacles and greater recovery space, especially if steep slopes, rip rap or other hazards are present. If the bike path is projected to have a substantial number of pedestrians, it should be widened to 12 feet as a dual purpose bike path, and striped for one pedestrian lane and two way bike traffic.

An 8 foot bike path width will suffice when:

1. The volume of bicycle traffic will be low - even during peak periods.
2. Adequate vertical and horizontal alignment is provided with frequent, safe passing opportunities.
3. Pedestrian use of the facility will be infrequent.
4. Maintenance vehicles and other heavy loads will not cause pavement edges to deteriorate.

MINIMUM BIKE PATH REQUIREMENTS




A 12 foot wide bike path is recommended when:

1. The volume of bicycle traffic will be relatively heavy.
2. The facility will be shared frequently with joggers, pedestrians and other non-bicycle users.
3. Heavy maintenance vehicles will use the facility.
4. On steep uphill grades.
5. Riding two abreast is likely such as pathways where group rides or family recreational riding is likely to occur.

All bike paths should be designed to reduce the risk of crime with consideration given to openness, visibility and lighting

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PATH



BIKEWAY DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

Design Speed:

For bikeways on County roads, the design speed of the roadway is generally adequate for bicycle speeds.

The speed that a bicyclist travels on a bike path is dependent on several factors including:

- Type and condition of the bicycle,
- Purpose of the trip,
- Condition and location of the path,
- Wind speed and direction,
- Physical condition and skill level of the bicyclist.

Bicycle paths should be designed for travel speeds that are at least as high as the prevailing speed of faster bicyclists.

Minimum design speed of a bike path is 20 MPH. When a bike path grade exceeds 4 percent, or where strong prevailing tail winds exist, such as East Multnomah County, a design speed of 30 MPH is advisable.

Radius of Curvature:

Radius of curvature is generally adequate for bikeways developed on County roads built to urban standards.

Care must be taken when designing bike paths to avoid sharp angles and short radius curves, particularly on long downhill grades where the velocity of a descending bicycle can be quite high.

The minimum radius of curvature negotiable by a bicycle is a function of the superelevation rate of the bike path surface, the coefficient of friction between bicycle tires and the bike path surface, and the speed of the bicycle. AASHTO specifies minimum design radii of curvature derived from the following formula.

$$R = \frac{V^2}{15(e+f)}$$

Where R = Minimum radius of curvature (ft),

V = Design speed (MPH),

e = Rate of superelevation,

f = Coefficient of friction.

Guide for the Development of New Bicycle Facilities, Copyright 1981. The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Washington, D.C. Used by permission.

DESIGN RADII FOR BICYCLE PATHS*

For most bike paths the superelevation rate will vary from a minimum of 2 percent (the minimum necessary for adequate drainage) to a maximum of 5 percent (beyond which maneuvering difficulties by slow bicyclists and adult tricyclists may occur). The minimum superelevation rate of 2 percent will be adequate for most conditions.

The coefficient of friction between bicycle and bike path depends on: surface type, road roughness and condition, tire type and condition, and whether the surface is wet or dry. Friction factors used for design should be selected based upon the point at which centrifugal force causes the bicyclist to recognize a feeling of discomfort and instinctively act to avoid higher speed. Extrapolating from values used in highway design, design friction factors for paved bike paths can be assumed to vary from 0.30 at 15 MPH to 0.22 at 30 MPH.

Based on a superelevation rate (e) of 2 percent, minimum radii of curvature can be selected from the following table.

Design Speed-V (MPH)	Friction Factor f	Design - R (Feet)
20	0.27	95
25	0.25	155
30	0.22	250
35	0.19	390
40	0.17	565

*e = 2%

Guide for the Development of New Bicycle Facilities, Copyright 1981. The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Washington, D.C. Used by permission.

When substandard radius curves must be used on bicycle paths because of right-of-way or topographical or other considerations, standard curve warning signs and supplemental pavement markings should be installed in accordance with the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and the State Bicycle Master Plan. The negative effects of substandard curves can also be partially offset by widening the pavement through the curves.

Grade:

Grades on bike paths should be kept to a minimum, especially on long inclines. It is most desirable that sustained grades be no greater than 4 percent, especially if a wide range of riding skills need to be accommodated.

Grades greater than 5 percent are undesirable because the ascents are difficult for bicyclists to climb and the descents cause some bicyclists to exceed speeds at which they are competent. Where terrain dictates, grades over 5 percent and less than 500 feet long are acceptable when a higher design speed is used and additional bike path width is provided.

Bike paths on a grade should have a level ramp at least 15 feet in length at intersections. This level area will permit the bicyclist to remain stopped without rolling into the intersection.

Drainage:

Drainage grates and other surface irregularities should be kept outside of bicycle travel lanes. Drainage inlets and other fixtures in the pavement should be kept flush with the riding surface on County roads. New road construction and reconstruction of existing roads should include curb inlet drainage grates whenever possible.

The recommended minimum pavement cross slope of 2 percent on bike paths will generally provide adequate drainage. Sloping in one direction, instead of crowning, is preferred and usually simplifies bike path drainage and construction. A smooth surface is essential to prevent water ponding and ice formation.

Where a bicycle path is constructed on a hillside, a ditch of suitable dimensions should be placed on the uphill side to intercept the run off. However, such ditches should not create hazard to bicyclists. Catch basins and culverts may be necessary to carry the intercepted water under the path. To reduce drainage from adjacent areas, bike path construction should include natural ground cover with seeding, mulching and sodding of adjacent slopes, and other erodible areas.




All parallel bar drainage grates located on County roads shall have steel cross straps welded perpendicular to the parallel bars. This will prevent bicycle wheels from dropping into the grate, potentially resulting in damage to the bicycle and injury to the rider.

Railroad Crossings:

Railroad/bikeway crossings should be at right angles. Crossings that deviate from a 90 degree angle create the potential for a bicyclist's front wheel to be trapped in the flangeway, possibly causing loss of steering control. It is also important that the bikeway approach be at the same elevation as the rails.

Crossing surface material and flangeway depth and width are important design parameters of bikeways at railroad crossings. The bicycle travel lane can be widened where the crossing angle is less than 90 degrees. This allows bicyclists adequate room to approach the tracks at a right angle. Where this is not possible, compressible flangeway fillers will improve bicycle safety. Whenever possible, abandoned tracks should be removed. Railroad warning signs and pavement markings will need to be installed on bikeways in accordance with MUTCD.

BIKEWAY RAILROAD CROSSING




Sight Distance:

Sight distance is the length of bikeway ahead that is clearly visible to bicyclists. Sufficient unobstructed sight distance must be provided so that bicyclists can either stop or take evasive action to avoid a collision. Adequate lateral vision is required at intersections and driveways.

A bike path should be designed with adequate stopping sight distances, per AASHTO guidelines. The distance required to bring a bicycle to a full controlled stop is a function of the bicyclist's perception and braking reaction time, speed of the bicycle, coefficient of friction between tires and pavement, and braking ability of the bicycle.

The following chart illustrates minimum stopping sight distances for various design speeds and grades based on a total perception and brake reaction time of 2.5 seconds, and a coefficient of friction of 0.25. This rate accounts for the poor wet-weather braking characteristics of many bicycles. For two-way bicycle paths, the sight distance in the descending direction, that is where "G" is negative, will control sight distance design.

STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE



$$S = \frac{V^2}{30(f \pm G)} + 3.67 V$$

Where: S = Stopping Sight Distance, Ft.

V = Velocity, mph

f = Coefficient of Friction (use 0.25)


G = Grade Ft./Ft. (rise/run)

Descend (-G) ———

Ascend (+G) - - -

The table below illustrates minimum length of vertical curve necessary to provide minimum stopping sight distance at various speeds on crests. Eye height of the bicyclist is assumed to be 4.5 feet, object height is assumed to be zero assuming hazards to bicycle travel exist at pavement level.

STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE: CREST VERTICAL CURVES




The Lateral Curve tables indicate minimum clearance that should be used to line-of-sight obstructions for horizontal curves. The desired lateral clearance is obtained by entering Lateral Curve data with stopping sight distance and the proposed horizontal radius of curvature.

Bicyclists frequently ride beside each other on bike paths. On narrow paths, bicyclists have a tendency to ride near the middle of the path. For these reasons, and because of the serious consequences of head-on bicycle accidents, lateral clearances on horizontal curves should be calculated based on the sum of the stopping sight distances for bicyclists traveling in opposite directions around the curve. Where this is not feasible, consideration should be given to:

- Widening the path through the curve,
- Installing a yellow center stripe,
- Installing a curve ahead warning sign,
- Some combination of these.

LATERAL CLEARANCE ON HORIZONTAL CURVES



Line of sight is 2.0' above centerline at point of obstruction.


S = Sight distance in feet.
 R = Radius of centerline in feet.
 m = Distance from centerline in feet.
 V = Design speed for S in mph.

Angle is expressed in degrees

$$m = R \left[\text{vers}^{-1} \left(\frac{28.65S}{R} \right) \right]$$

$$S = \frac{R}{28.65} \left[\cos^{-1} \left(\frac{R-m}{R} \right) \right]$$

Formula applies only when S is equal to or less than length of curve.



Guide for the Development of New Bicycle Facilities, Copyright 1981. The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Washington, D.C. Used by permission.

Lighting:

Fixed-source lighting may be necessary to reduce conflicts along bikeways and at intersections. Lighting allows bicyclists to see better the travel lane ahead, and is a deterrent to crime. Lighting should be considered where night riding is expected, such as bikeways serving college students or commuters.

Lighting is important at major intersections, through underpasses or tunnels, and when nighttime security could be a problem. Depending on the location, average maintained horizontal illumination levels of 0.5 foot-candle (5 lux) to 2 foot-candles (22 lux) is desirable. Where special security problems exist, higher illumination levels may be necessary. Light standards (poles) should meet recommended horizontal and vertical clearances. Luminares and standards need to be at a scale appropriate for the bikeway and vandal resistant. The IES Lighting Handbook Applications Edition provides more specific illuminance standards.

Restrictions to Motor Vehicles:

Bike paths may need a physical barrier or adequate signing to prevent unauthorized motor vehicles from using the exclusive bikeway. Removable posts or bollards restrict motor vehicle access while permitting entrance by authorized vehicles. Any barrier should be highly visible to cyclists. Posts and bollards need to be permanently reflectorized for nighttime visibility and painted a bright color for improved daytime visibility. When more than one post is used, a 5-foot spacing is recommended. Wider spacing can allow entry to motor vehicles, while narrower spacing might prevent entry by adult tricycles and bicycles with trailers.

Intersections:

Intersections are an important consideration in bikeway design. If alternate locations for a bikeway are available, the route with the fewest intersections or the most favorable intersection conditions should be selected. To cross freeways and other high speed, high volume roads, a grade separated structure may be the best solution. Cost of a structure will be relatively high but reduced congestion and level of safety gained will support the decision to provide grade-separated crossings.

For at-grade intersections, turning movements must be considered, and motor vehicle and bicycle rights of way defined. Motor vehicles turning right at an intersection can be particularly hazardous to bicyclists. The type of traffic control to be used (signal, stop sign, yield sign) should be selected by application of warrants from the MUTCD. Bicycles are counted as vehicles in these determinations and may be given priority at some intersections.

Where bikeways cross high speed, or high volume multiple lane roads, a median island refuge area or bicycle activated signal is advisable to accommodate the crossing movement.

Bicycles and motor vehicles should be controlled at intersections of major streets and bikeways by using standard traffic control devices.

The type, size and location of traffic signs should also be in accordance with the MUTCD. Care is needed to ensure that bikeway signs are located so they do not confuse motorists. Conversely, road signs need to be located where they do not confuse bicyclists.

Traffic detection devices need to be sensitive to bicycles. A bicyclist can usually cross an intersection under the same signal phasing as motor vehicles. However, multi-lane streets require special consideration to ensure that short clearance intervals are not used. To check the signal clearance interval, a bicycle speed of 10 MPH and a perception/reaction/braking time of 2.5 seconds should be used.

Detectors for traffic-actuated signals that are sensitive to bicycles, should be located in the bicyclist's expected path, including left turn lanes. Bicyclist activated signals should be conveniently located so that dismounting is not required. Programmed visibility signal heads should be checked to ensure that heads are visible to bicyclists who are properly positioned on the road.

It is preferable that a bike path crossing an arterial street be located away from other congestion, such as highways and shopping centers.

Bike path intersections and approaches should be on relatively flat grades with adequate stopping sight distances. Advance warning must be given to permit bicyclists to safely stop prior to reaching the intersection, especially on downgrades.

Normal rules of the road (ORS 811.005-811.730) should apply to separate bike path/street intersections. Where constraints preclude development of separate intersections, other options should be considered that minimize congestion and hazards to bicyclists. Bike paths may need to cross major streets at, or adjacent to pedestrian crossings. Intersection design and control should not result in unconventional vehicle turning movements that compromise bicyclist safety.

The MUTCD and Oregon Bicycle Master Plan should be consulted for guidance on signs and pavement markings. Where bicyclists are expected to use different routes than motorists, directional signing is necessary, confirming to cyclists that the bike route leads to their desired destination.

Vertical and Horizontal Clearance

A minimum 2 foot shy distance on both sides of a bikeway is necessary for safe operation. Three feet is preferable. Vertical clearance to obstructions including tunnels and undercrossings should be a minimum of 8 feet. Vertical clearance may need to be greater to permit passage of maintenance vehicles. A vertical clearance of 10 feet is preferred.

Fencing or other barriers may be necessary to insure safety for bikeways located in close proximity to steep slopes or waterways. Hedges, trees, and native growth can be an effective aesthetic barrier.

A minimum 5 foot separation between a bike path and an adjacent roadway is required, confirming to both bicyclist and motorist that the bike path is a separate, non-motorized right-of-way. When the distance between the edge of the roadway and the bike path is less than 5 feet, a suitable physical divider such as a fence, dense shrubs or other barrier should be provided. Dividers prevent bicyclists from moving between the path and the roadway, and reinforce the concept that the bike path is an independent facility. Barriers should be a minimum 4.5 feet high.

Road Surface Materials:

Portland cement concrete is the preferred material for bikeways. Concrete provides a smooth riding surface with low maintenance costs. It does not become brittle, cracked and rough with age, or deformed with roots and weeds as often occurs with asphalt concrete.

Bicycle lanes are usually built of the same material as the adjacent road. Therefore, bike lanes are most often constructed of asphalt concrete which is also a suitable choice for a bicycle riding surface.

Oil mat roads generally do not have an adequate base and provide a substandard, uneven riding surface. Oil mat is discouraged for most types of bikeways, except low volume facilities and rural roads.

Gravel roads and shoulders would not be used by most bicyclists except mountain bike riders who would also favor dirt trails.

Paved County bikeways should have the standard road base material and thickness to accommodate motor vehicles. Bike paths need to be designed and constructed to accommodate maintenance and emergency vehicles.

To protect paved bikeways from future damage, tree roots and other vegetation should be removed from the bikeway prior to paving. Vegetation control may be necessary to prevent tree roots, berry bushes and other plants from damaging the riding surface.



BRIDGES, RAMPS, AND OTHER STRUCTURES

Bridges:

Bridges are essential links in the regional transportation system. Those bridge crossings that are hazardous, inefficient, or prohibited to cyclists are detrimental to regional bicycle travel. Most bridges, such as those crossing the Willamette River and area freeways, are vital connectors that span barriers and assure regional accessibility.

Many existing bridges and ramps were built without consideration for preferential bicycle travel. Some have been improved to accommodate bicyclists. The Broadway Bridge, for example, has a bikeway and traffic signal that allow cyclists to safely access downtown Portland.

Provisions should be made to accommodate safe bicycling on any new or rehabilitated County bridge or ramp.

These may include:

- ° Bike lanes
- ° Wide outside lanes (12 - 14 feet) for shared use with motor vehicles.
- ° Wide walkways for shared use with pedestrians.
- ° Exclusive bike paths.

The expected traffic (motorized, bicycle and pedestrian) and cost will be considered in determining which type of facility should be used.

New Structures:

Overpasses, underpasses, and other bicycle facilities on County bridges and ramps may be necessary to provide continuity to the regional bikeway network.

On new structures, the minimum clear unobstructed width should be the same as, or greater than the approaching bikeway. Preferred clearance should include the minimum 2 foot wide shy areas. Carrying the clear area continuously across the structure has two advantages:

1. It provides a consistent shy distance between railings and barriers, and;
2. It provides needed maneuvering space to avoid conflicts with pedestrians and other bicyclists on the bridge.

Access by emergency and maintenance vehicles should be considered in establishing the design clearances on bridge and ramp bikeways. Bridges designed exclusively for bicycle traffic should also be designed for pedestrian live loads.

New or rehabilitated bridges, ramps, and culverts should be designed to:

- a. Be wide enough to provide for paved shoulders, curb lanes or other bikeway facilities, including railings;
- b. Eliminate narrow constrictions that force bicyclists to abandon the shoulder or curb lane and merge into motor vehicle lanes.

On all bridge decks and ramps, special care should be taken to ensure that bicycle safe expansion joints are used.

Railings, fencings or barriers on both sides of a bridge bikeway should be a minimum of 4.5 feet high. Smooth rub rails need to be attached to the barriers at a handlebar height of 3.5 feet.

Retrofitting:

Where it is necessary to retrofit a bikeway onto an existing County bridge or ramp, several alternatives should be considered depending on the geometrics of the structure.

1. Provide one-way bicycle lanes over the bridge or ramp where:
 - a. The bike lanes connect to bicycle facilities at both ends of the bridge; and,
 - b. Sufficient width exists or can be obtained by widening or restriping.
2. Provide a two-way bicycle path on a bridge on one side only. This should be done where:
 - a. The bridge or ramp connects to a bikeway at both ends; and,
 - b. Sufficient width exists on one side of the bridge, or can be obtained by narrowing or restriping lanes to allow two-way bicycle travel; and,
 - c. Provisions are made to physically separate bicycle and motor vehicle traffic.

BIKEWAY MAINTENANCE

3. Using existing sidewalks as one-way or two-way facilities. This may be appropriate where:
 - a. Conflicts between bicyclists and pedestrians will not exceed tolerable limits; and
 - b. Sidewalks have adequate width to accommodate both.
4. Provide wide curb lanes where sufficient width exists or can be obtained.

Because of the large number of variables involved in retrofitting bicycle facilities onto existing bridges and ramps, compromises in desirable design criteria are often inevitable. Therefore, the facility to be provided may be determined, on a case by case basis, after thoroughly considering all the opportunities and constraints.

In certain situations where bicycles and pedestrians cannot safely share a constricted sidewalk, bicyclists may be required to dismount and walk their bikes even though the bridge is connected on both ends to bikeways.

Bicycle facilities require a higher level of maintenance service than facilities for motor vehicles.

Sweeping and Mowing:

Sweeping streets and mowing occurs on a continuous cycle and at the present level of service appears adequate in the urban area. Sweeping should occur more often in the following instances:

- a. Where specific problem locations are known along bikeways e.g., where debris accumulates and requires more frequent removal.
- b. Where a potentially hazardous situation is reported to the County by a concerned citizen, the standard for maintenance response should be within two working days of the report.
- c. Following snow and ice storms where road sanding was required. Bike ways should receive priority attention to remove the sand that has been blown onto the bikeway.
- d. Immediately following mowing if vegetation from mowing accumulates on the bikeway.

Sweeping and mowing of non-curbed and rural bikeways should be scheduled on a timely basis to eliminate debris and overhanging vegetation on bike lanes, bike routes and shoulder bikeways. This is especially critical during good weather months when more people use their bicycles as a means of travel and recreation, and vegetation is likely to intrude into bikeways.

As Multnomah County implements rural bikeways, to support the Columbia River Gorge Scenic Area for example, greater attention will need to be focused on providing well maintained rural bikeways.

Debris often collects where motor vehicles cross bikeways from unpaved areas such as: driveways and gravel roads, unpaved parking areas, and access to fields and timberland. More frequent sweeping will be necessary at these locations to remove the dirt and gravel that is certain to accumulate on the bikeway.

Particular maintenance care and attention needs to be directed to bikeways that receive heavy usage by families and inexperienced riders, such as the bike path east of Blue Lake Park, to assure that the riding surface is relatively hazard free.

Resurfacing:

When resurfacing a road segment, drainage grates, utility covers and other irregularities in the road should be adjusted to be flush with the finish grade.

When patching pavement and repairing potholes, the edge between old and new pavement should be flush to maintain a smooth riding surface. Ridges in pavement at railroad crossings, and utility cuts should also be ground down to provide a smooth travel lane.

A 10 foot deep apron can be added during resurfacing, to entrances from unpaved surfaces that cause debris to accumulate on the bikeway.

Resurfacing should not result in seams or longitudinal cracks within the bikeway. Care is needed to provide a smooth transition between the existing pavement and resurface material when adding shoulders or widening an existing road. Base material should be added before widening the road to better accommodate cyclists, with the same or better specifications as the existing roadbed.

TRAFFIC CONTROL

Even with the greatest attention to bicycle compatible road design, there may be instances or locations where it is not feasible to fully implement bicycle guidelines. Bicyclists, like motorists, need to be regulated in their use of the public right-of-way, or advised as to hazards or necessary cautions. The Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) will determine what traffic control means are appropriate. The five objectives of traffic control are:

1. Fulfill a need
2. Command attention
3. Convey a clear, simple meaning
4. Command respect of right-of-way users
5. Give adequate time for proper responses


Design, placement, operation, maintenance and uniformity of traffic control facilities are all important in regulating and advising bicyclists and motorists. Bicycle signs perform one of three basic purposes:

Bicycle Signage:


1. Regulatory signs inform cyclists, pedestrians, and motorists of traffic laws and regulations, and indicate the applicability of legal requirements that would not otherwise be apparent. Regulatory signs should be erected at the point where the regulation applies. The message should be clearly indicated, and easily visible and legible to cyclists and motorists.



2. Warning signs are used to warn bicyclists and motorists of existing or potential hazardous conditions on, or adjacent to a road or path. Warning signs in the MUTCD do not cover all potentially hazardous conditions. If other warning signs are needed, they should be of standard shape and color with brief, easily understood messages. Warning signs include:



3. Guide signs are special bikeway route signs that are erected at decision points along the route. They may be informational—describing route direction changes, or confirming signs—assuring that the route direction has been accurately perceived. Guide signing should be repeated at regular intervals, letting cyclists know of the designated bikeway. Similar guide signing is appropriate for lane sharing and shoulder bikeways to assure that bicyclists do not stray from the facility and lose their way. Supplemental plaques are recommended that furnish such information as distances and destinations.



Conservative use of regulatory and warning signs is best as they tend to lose their effectiveness if used to excess. Frequent use of guide signs does not lessen their value, and keeps bicyclists on the bikeway system and on course to their destination.

Locations where unavoidable obstacles remain such as narrow bridges or roads that are substandard for lane sharing, warning signs and pavement striping should be employed to:

1. Inform bicyclists as to the condition
2. Alert motorists to the possible presence of bicyclists
3. Identify alternative bicycle routes
4. In some other way, mitigate the condition.

Multnomah County street standards and functional street classification system both influence the type of bikeway and traffic control to be provided on County roads. In some cases, these standards may need to be revised to provide greater opportunities to develop a comprehensive bicycle network.

Pavement Marking:

Pavement marking is important on bicycle lanes and paths. Markings indicate the separation of bike lanes from motor vehicle lanes, identify the preferential bicycle facility, provide advance information regarding turning and crossing maneuvers, and separate bicycle and pedestrian traffic on bicycle/pedestrian paths.

Pavement markings should be reflectorized on bikeways, using standard MUTCD markings. The frequent use of symbols and simple word messages stenciled on bike lanes and paths can be an effective method of supplementing sign messages.


Bikeways are generally not marked through intersections. However, if necessary to direct traffic or reduce congestion, a dotted line may be used to distinguish the bikeway from other travel lanes.

Centerlines may be necessary on bike paths with high traffic volumes, where sight distance is limited, or where traffic control is otherwise needed. A double solid yellow line should be used to designate no passing or no traveling to the left of center. A broken yellow line should be used to separate two directions of bike traffic. A solid white lane is used to separate pedestrians from cyclists on a joint use facility.

The diamond-shaped preferential lane symbols are used on streets where bike lanes are designated. This marking is used immediately after the intersection to inform motorists of the restricted lane.

Objects located adjacent to bikeways can be avoided with little difficulty if clearly visible to the rider. Such objects should be marked with highly visible markings to make their identification by approaching riders more certain.

Preferred Intersection Marking



Traffic Signals:

At intersections where programmed signals are used, attention should be given to adjusting the signals so that bicyclists in their travel lanes can easily see the signals. If programmed signals cannot be adjusted to serve the bicyclist, then separate signals should be provided. Bicycles generally can cross intersections under the same signal timing arrangements as motor vehicles. Where bicycle use is expected, short signal intervals should not be used.

Traffic detector loops used along bikeways should be able to detect a bicycle. As an alternative, a signal activating push button should be considered on some types of streets. Push buttons should be located for convenient access by cyclists.



APPENDICES

**BICYCLE ACCIDENT DATA
OREGON VEHICLE
CODE
GLOSSARY**

**BICYCLE
ACCIDENT
DATA**

BICYCLE ACCIDENTS

Accidents involving bicyclists are not uncommon in Multnomah County. A review of the reported accident data demonstrates the need for safe bicycle facilities, reduced conflict with motorists and perhaps most importantly, training and education on safe and defensive riding behavior.

The State of Oregon gathers accident data from incident reports of State and local police agencies. Accidents involving bicycles on County roads from 1984 through 1988 were examined for relevant information. The most severe bicycle accidents, all bicycle fatalities and many injury accidents are reported to police authorities. Many non-injury, or property damage, or single bike injury accidents may not be reported. The data included here is biased towards the worse cases. However, within this context, valuable insights can be gained by the conclusions drawn from accident data.

A total of 209 accidents involving bicycles on County roads were reported over the five year period 1984-89, averaging 42 incidents per year. The following table illustrate that most bicycle accidents occur during the week (85%) as opposed to weekend bicycling (15%). Seventy-three percent of reported bicycle accidents occur from 1 p.m. to 8 p.m. on any given day.

BICYCLE ACCIDENTS BY DAY OF WEEK: 1984-1988

Day of Week	Number of reported accidents	Percent of total records
Sun	9	4%
Mon	29	14%
Tue	34	16%
Wed	39	19%
Thr	31	15%
Fri	43	21%
Sat	24	11%
209 Total Accidents		


It would seem that wet weather conditions do not contribute to conditions causing most bicycle accidents: Road conditions were dry for 87 percent of accidents (74% clear and 12% cloudy conditions). Road conditions were wet for 13 percent of bicycle accidents (3% cloudy and 10% rainy conditions).

BICYCLE ACCIDENTS BY WEATHER CONDITIONS: 1984-1988

WEATHER	ROAD CONDITIONS				TOTALS	
	Dry		Wet			
Clear	154	74%	0	0%	154	74%
Cloudy	26	12%	6	3%	32	15%
Rain	0	0%	20	10%	20	10%
Fog	0	0%	1	0%	1	0.5%
Unknown	0	0%	1	0%	1	0.5%
TOTALS	181	87%	28	13%	209	100%



Multnomah County Bicycle Safety Program
Bicycle Accidents by Day of Week




EP_bik8



Multnomah County Bicycle Safety Program

Bicycle Accidents by Time of Day



EP_b1k7

Two of the most revealing statistics concerning bicycle accidents involve who was at fault in causing the accident and age of bicyclist. Over the five year period, the bicycle operator was in error 65% of the time, motorists 26% of the time, both 7% and undetermined 2%. The conclusion to be drawn is that bicyclists riding unsafely or unlawfully are responsible much of the time for bicycle accidents.

Bicycle accidents often involve children and teenagers. Sixty-nine percent of bike accidents involve cyclists between the ages of 6 and 19.

PERCENT ACCIDENTS BY AGE

- 18% 10 years and younger
- 51% 11 to 19 years of age
- 18% 20 years and older
- 10% age unknown.
- 100%

Bicycle Accidents by Age of Cyclist: 1984-1988

Age of Bicyclist	Number of reported accidents	Percent of total records
0	21	10.0 %
5	3	1.4 %
6	8	3.8 %
7	5	2.4 %
8	4	1.9 %
9	10	4.8 %
10	8	3.8 %
11	10	4.8 %
12	14	6.7 %
13	16	7.7 %
14	10	4.8 %
15	12	5.7 %
16	9	4.3 %
17	15	7.2 %
18	10	4.8 %
19	10	4.8 %
20	6	2.9 %
21	1	0.5 %
22	4	1.9 %
23	3	1.4 %
27	2	1.0 %
28	1	0.5 %
29	5	2.4 %
30	1	0.5 %
32	1	0.5 %
33	3	1.4 %
34	2	1.0 %
35	3	1.4 %
37	1	0.5 %
38	1	0.5 %
39	3	1.4 %
41	1	0.5 %
42	1	0.5 %
44	1	0.5 %
50	1	0.5 %
51	1	0.5 %
68	1	0.5 %
86	1	0.5 %

 209 Total Accidents


The population under 20 years of age is the group most susceptible to bicycle accidents. A large portion of these accidents occur in the urban area, on the arterial and collector road system where traffic volumes are relatively high.

The accident profile most strongly suggested by this data is that bicycle accidents happen weekday afternoons during good weather involving young people who are most likely at fault. While this scenario is greatly over simplified, it is helpful in designing a bicycle safety program. A definable and measurable objective is to reduce the number of accidents involving young bicyclists on County roads.

Aside from building a relatively safe network of bikeways, changing bicyclists' behavior is another essential component to reduce accidents. Providing information, education and training, as well as greater enforcement of vehicle laws, are necessary to improve the awareness and skill level of bicyclists.

The County Bicycle Program can provide public information and education materials as a means to improve safety and reduce bicycle accidents. However, there are funding constraints that limit the level of direct County involvement. Other providers may be in a better position to change cyclists' behavior. Schools, police agencies and courts, service organizations and the private sector each have the potential to contribute to improving the awareness and skills of bicyclists. The County Bicycle Program would have an indirect role of coordinating and facilitating others in this effort to improve the bicycling environment throughout Multnomah County.

Operator Error



**OREGON VEHICLE
CODE**

BICYCLES

814.400 Application of vehicle laws to bicycles. (1) Every person riding a bicycle upon a public way is subject to the provisions applicable to and has the same rights and duties as the driver of any other vehicle concerning operating on highways, vehicle equipment and abandoned vehicles, except:

(a) Those provisions which by their very nature can have no application.

(b) When otherwise specifically provided under the vehicle code.

(2) Subject to the provisions of subsection (1) of this section:

(a) A bicycle is a vehicle for purposes of the vehicle code; and

(b) When the term "vehicle" is used the term shall be deemed to be applicable to bicycles.

(3) The provisions of the vehicle code relating to the operation of bicycles do not relieve a bicyclist or motorist from the duty to exercise due care. [1983 c.338 §697; 1985 c.16 §335]

814.410 Unsafe operation of bicycle on sidewalk; penalty. (1) A person commits the offense of unsafe operation of a bicycle on a sidewalk if the person does any of the following:

(a) Operates the bicycle so as to suddenly leave a curb or other place of safety and move into the path of a vehicle that is so close as to constitute an immediate hazard.

(b) Operates a bicycle upon a sidewalk and does not give an audible warning before overtaking and passing a pedestrian and does not yield the right of way to all pedestrians on the sidewalk.

(c) Operates a bicycle on a sidewalk in a careless manner that endangers or would be likely to endanger any person or property.

(d) Operates the bicycle at a speed greater than an ordinary walk when approaching or entering a crosswalk, approaching or crossing a driveway or crossing a curb cut or pedestrian ramp and a motor vehicle is approaching the crosswalk, driveway, curb cut or pedestrian ramp. This paragraph does not require reduced speeds for bicycles either:

(A) At places on sidewalks or other pedestrian ways other than places where the path for pedestrians or bicycle traffic approaches or crosses that for motor vehicle traffic; or

(B) When motor vehicles are not present.

(2) Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, a bicyclist on a sidewalk or in a crosswalk has the same rights and duties as a pedestrian on a sidewalk or in a crosswalk.

(3) The offense described in this section, unsafe operation of a bicycle on a sidewalk, is a Class D traffic infraction. [1983 c.338 §699; 1985 c.16 §337]

814.420 Failure to use bicycle lane or path; exceptions; penalty. (1) Except as provided in subsection (2) of this section, a person commits the offense of failure to use a bicycle lane or path if the person operates a bicycle on any portion of a roadway that is not a bicycle lane or bicycle path when a bicycle lane or bicycle path is adjacent to or near the roadway.

(2) A person is not required to comply with this section unless the state or local authority with jurisdiction over the roadway finds, after public hearing, that the bicycle lane or bicycle path is suitable for safe bicycle use at reasonable rates of speed.

(3) The offense described in this section, failure to use a bicycle lane or path, is a Class D traffic infraction. [1983 c.338 §700; 1985 c.16 §338]

814.430 Improper use of lanes; exceptions; penalty. (1) A person commits the offense of improper use of lanes by a bicycle if the person is operating a bicycle on a roadway at less than the normal speed of traffic using the roadway at that time and place under the existing conditions and the person does not ride as close as practicable to the right curb or edge of the roadway.

(2) A person is not in violation of the offense under this section if the person is not operating a bicycle as close as practicable to the right curb or edge of the roadway under any of the following circumstances:

(a) When overtaking and passing another bicycle or vehicle that is proceeding in the same direction.

(b) When preparing to execute a left turn.

(c) When reasonably necessary to avoid hazardous conditions including, but not limited to, fixed or moving objects, parked or moving vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians, animals, surface hazards or other conditions that make continued operation along the right curb or edge unsafe or to avoid unsafe operation in a lane on the roadway that is too narrow for a bicycle and vehicle to travel safely side by side. Nothing in this paragraph excuses the operator of a bicycle from the requirements under ORS 811.425 or from the penalties for failure to comply with those requirements.

(d) When operating within a city as near as practicable to the left curb or edge of a roadway that is designated to allow traffic to move in only one direction along the roadway. A bicycle that is operated under this paragraph is subject to the same requirements and exceptions when operating along the left curb or edge as are applicable when a bicycle is operating along the right curb or edge of the roadway.

(e) When operating a bicycle along side not more than one other bicycle as long as the bicycles are both being operated within a single lane and in a manner that does not impede the normal and reasonable movement of traffic.

(f) When operating on a bicycle lane or bicycle path.

(3) The offense described in this section, improper use of lanes by a bicycle, is a Class D traffic infraction. [1983 c.338 §701; 1985 c.16 §339]

814.440 Failure to signal turn; exceptions; penalty. (1) A person commits the offense of failure to signal for a bicycle turn if the person does any of the following:

(a) Stops a bicycle the person is operating without giving the appropriate hand and arm signal continuously for at least 100 feet before executing the stop.

(b) Executes a turn on a bicycle the person is operating without giving the appropriate hand and arm signal for the turn for at least 100 feet before executing the turn.

(c) Executes a turn on a bicycle the person is operating after having been stopped without giving, while stopped, the appropriate hand and arm signal for the turn.

(2) A person is not in violation of the offense under this section if the person is operating a bicycle and does not give the appropriate signal continuously for a stop or turn because circumstances require that both hands be used to safely control or operate the bicycle.

(3) The appropriate hand and arm signals for indicating turns and stops under this section are those provided for other vehicles under ORS 811.395 and 811.400.

(4) The offense described under this section, failure to signal for a bicycle turn, is a Class D traffic infraction. [1983 c.338 §703; 1985 c.16 §341]

814.450 Unlawful load on a bicycle; penalty. (1) A person commits the offense of having an unlawful load on a bicycle if the person is operating a bicycle and the person carries a package, bundle or article which prevents the person from keeping at least one hand upon the handlebar and having full control at all times.

(2) The offense described in this section, unlawful load on a bicycle, is a Class D traffic infraction. [1983 c.338 §704]

814.460 Unlawful passengers on bicycle; penalty. (1) A person commits the offense of unlawful passengers on a bicycle if the person operates a bicycle and carries more persons on the bicycle than the number for which it is designed or safely equipped.

(2) The offense described in this section, unlawful passengers on a bicycle, is a Class D traffic infraction. [1983 c.338 §705]

814.470 Failure to use bicycle seat; penalty. (1) A person commits the offense of failure to use a bicycle seat if the person is operating a bicycle and the person rides other than upon or astride a permanent and regular seat attached to the bicycle.

(2) The offense described in this section, failure to use bicycle seat, is a Class D traffic infraction. [1983 c.338 §706]

814.480 Nonmotorized vehicle clinging to another vehicle; penalty. (1) A person commits the offense of nonmotorized vehicle clinging to another vehicle if the person is riding upon or operating a bicycle, coaster, roller skates, sled or toy vehicle and the person clings to another vehicle upon a roadway or attaches that which the person is riding or operating to any other vehicle upon a roadway.

(2) The offense described in this section, nonmotorized vehicle clinging to another vehicle, is a Class D traffic infraction. [1983 c.338 §707]

811.050 Failure to yield to bicycle on bicycle lane. (1) A person commits the offense of failure of a motor vehicle operator to yield to a bicycle on a bicycle lane if the person is operating a motor vehicle and the person does not yield the right of way to a person operating a bicycle or moped upon a bicycle lane.

(2) This section does not require persons operating mopeds to yield the right of way to bicycles if the mopeds are operated on bicycle lanes in the manner permitted under ORS 811.440.

(3) The offense described in this section, failure of a motor vehicle operator to yield to a bicycle on a bicycle lane, is a Class B traffic infraction. [1983 c.338 §698; 1985 c.16 §336]

811.055 Failure to yield to bicyclist on sidewalk. (1) The driver of a motor vehicle commits the offense of failure to yield the right of way to a bicyclist on a sidewalk if the driver does not yield the right of way to any bicyclist on a sidewalk.

(2) The driver of a motor vehicle is not in violation of this section when a bicyclist is operating in violation of ORS 814.410. Nothing in this subsection relieves the driver of a motor vehicle from the duty to exercise due care.

(3) The offense described in this section, failure to yield the right of way to a bicyclist on a sidewalk, is a Class C traffic infraction. [1983 c.338 §702; 1985 c.16 §340]

811.395 Appropriate signals for stopping, turning, changing lanes and decelerating. This section establishes appropriate signals, for purposes of the vehicle code, for use when signals are required while stopping, turning, changing lanes or suddenly decelerating a vehicle. This section does not authorize the use of only hand and arm signals when the use of signal lights is required under ORS 811.405. Vehicle lighting equipment described in this section is vehicle lighting equipment for which standards are established under ORS 816.100 and 816.120. Appropriate signals are as follows:

(1) To indicate a left turn either of the following:

(a) Hand and arm extended horizontally from the left side of the vehicle.

(b) Activation of front and rear turn signal lights on the left side of the vehicle.

(2) To indicate a right turn either of the following:

(a) Hand and arm extended upward from the left side of the vehicle. A person who is operating a bicycle is not in violation of this paragraph if the person signals a right turn

by extending the person's right hand and arm horizontally.

(b) Activation of front and rear turn signal lights on the right side of the vehicle.

(3) To indicate a stop or a decrease in speed either of the following:

(a) Hand and arm extended downward from the left side of the vehicle; or

(b) Activation of brake lights on the vehicle.

(4) Change of lane by activation of both front and rear turn signal lights on the side of the vehicle toward which the change of lane is made. [1983 c.338 §635; 1985 c.16 §314]

811.435 Operation of motor vehicle on bicycle trail; exemptions; penalty. (1) A person commits the offense of operation of a motor vehicle on a bicycle lane if the person operates a motor vehicle upon a bicycle lane or a bicycle path.

(2) Exemptions to this section are provided under ORS 811.440.

(3) This section is not applicable to mopeds. ORS 811.440 and 814.210 control the operation and use of mopeds on bicycle lanes and paths.

(4) The offense described in this section, operation of a motor vehicle on a bicycle trail, is a Class B traffic infraction. [1983 c.338 §643]

811.440 When motor vehicles may operate on bicycle lane. This section provides exemptions from the prohibitions under ORS 811.435 and 814.210 against operating motor vehicles on bicycle lanes and paths. The following vehicles are not subject to ORS 811.435 and 814.210 under the circumstances described:

(1) A person may operate a moped on a bicycle lane that is immediately adjacent to the roadway only while the moped is being exclusively powered by human power.

(2) A person may operate a motor vehicle upon a bicycle lane when:

(a) Making a turn;

(b) Entering or leaving an alley, private road or driveway; or

(c) Required in the course of official duty.

(3) An implement of husbandry may momentarily cross into a bicycle lane to permit other vehicles to overtake and pass the implement of husbandry. [1983 c.338 §643]

811.490 Improper opening or leaving open of vehicle door; penalty. (1) A person commits the offense of improper opening or leaving open a vehicle door if the person does any of the following:

(a) Opens any door of a vehicle unless and until it is reasonably safe to do so and it can be done without interference with the movement of traffic, or with pedestrians and bicycles on sidewalks or shoulders.

(b) Leaves a door open on the side of a vehicle available to traffic, or to pedestrians or bicycles on sidewalks or shoulders for a period of time longer than necessary to load or unload passengers.

(2) The offense described in this section, improper opening or leaving open a vehicle door, is a Class D traffic infraction. [1983 c.338 §655; 1985 c.16 §320]

GLOSSARY

GLOSSARY

ADT: Average Daily Traffic, based on a 24-hour count and adjusted for fluctuations by the day of the week and the month.

AASHTO: American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials and including their publications.

Bicycle: A vehicle that operates on the ground, propelled solely by human power.

Bicycle Facilities: A general term denoting improvements and provisions made by public agencies to accommodate or encourage bicycling, including parking facilities, all bikeways and shared roadways not specifically designed for bicycle use.

Bicycle Route (Bike Route): A segment of a system of bikeways.

Bike Lane: A portion of a roadway which has been designated by striping, signing, and pavement markings for the preferential or exclusive use of bicyclists.

Bike Path: A bikeway physically separated from motorized vehicular traffic by an open space or barrier and either within the road right-of-way or within an independent right-of-way.

Bikeway: Any road, path or way which in some manner is specifically designated as being open to bicycle travel, regardless of whether such facilities are designated for the exclusive use of bicycles or are to be shared with other transportation modes.

Clearance, Lateral: Width required for safe passage of a bicycle as measured in a horizontal plane.

Clearance, Vertical: Height necessary for the safe passage of a bicycle as measured in a vertical plane.

Commuter Cyclist: A person who uses a bicycle for transportation to the workplace.

Dual-Purpose Bike Path: A wide bike path with separate lanes for bicycle use and pedestrian use.

Grade Separation: Vertical isolation of travel ways through use of a structure so that traffic crosses without interference.

Lane-Sharing Bikeway: A road designated and signed as a bike route, where bicycles and motor vehicles share the travel lanes. Lane-sharing bikeways are typically on roads with low traffic volume and low speeds.

Motor Vehicle: A vehicle that is self-propelled or designed for self-propulsion.

Mountain Bike: A bicycle with wide tires and upright handlebars, designed for recreational riding on unpaved surfaces.

MUTCD: Abbreviation for Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, approved by the Federal Highway Administration as a national standard for placement and selection of all traffic control devices on or adjacent to all roadways open to public travel.

Pavement Marking: Painted or applied line(s) placed on any bikeway surface for regulation, guiding or warning traffic.

Pedestrian: A person whose mode of traffic is on foot. A person walking a bicycle is a pedestrian.

Recreational Cyclist: An individual who uses a bicycle for the enjoyment of bicycle travel. Ultimate destination is of secondary importance.

Right-of-Way: A general term denoting land, property, or interest therein, usually in a strip, acquired for or devoted to transportation purposes.

Right of Way: The right of one vehicle or pedestrian to proceed in a lawful manner in preference to another vehicle or pedestrian.

Roadway: The portion of the road right-of-way for vehicle use.

Rules of the Road: That portion of a vehicle law which contains regulations governing the operation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

Shared Road: Any road not prohibited to bicycle use, where travel must be shared by bicyclists and motorists.

Shoulder: A portion of the road right-of-way that is primarily for use by pedestrians, bicyclists, and emergency use of stopped vehicles.

Shoulder Bikeway: A type of bikeway where bicycle travel is designated on the shoulder of the roadway.

Shy Distance: The distance between the bikeway's edge and any fixed object capable of injuring a cyclist using the bikeway.

Sidewalk: The portion of a highway or street designed for preferential or exclusive use by pedestrians.


Sight Distance: A measurement of the cyclist's visibility, unobstructed by traffic, along the normal travel path to the furthest point of the roadway surface.

Sport Cyclist: A person who uses a bicycle for exercise, fitness, and sport.


Traffic Control Devices: Signs, signals or other fixtures, whether permanent or temporary, placed on or adjacent to a travel way by authority of a public body having jurisdiction to regulate, warn or guide traffic.

Traffic Volume: The given number of vehicles that pass a given point for a given amount of time (hour, day, year).





Vehicle: A device for transporting a person or goods along a public road. A vehicle maybe powered by human, gasoline, or other energy sources.



MULTNOMAH COUNTY
GUIDE TO 1990 BIKEWAY PLAN MAPS



SCALE: 1" = 3 MILES



RURAL EAST
-ENCLOSED-
(NO MAP)


EXHIBIT C



MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

1990 BIKEWAYS PLAN MAP


SOUTHWEST POCKETS



0 2000


6/90

The 1990 Bikeway Plan Maps represent the comprehensive County bicycle network as planned. The designated facilities are to be preserved and improved over time to better accommodate bicycling. No warranty or guarantee is made, at this time, as to the suitability of the roadway condition or fitness of the route for bicycling. Modifications to the system will be made as conditions warrant.



LAKE OSWEGO

The 1990 Bikeway Plan Maps represent the comprehensive County bicycle network as planned. The designated facilities are to be preserved and improved over time to better accommodate bicycling. No warranty or guarantee is made, at this time, as to the suitability of the roadway condition or fitness of the route for bicycling. Modifications to the system will be made as conditions warrant.



 MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

**1990 BIKEWAYS PLAN MAP
WESTSIDE POCKETS**

Planned Bikeways 




0 2000

6/90

1990 BIKEWAYS PLAN MAP


WILLAMETTE RIVER BRIDGES



0 2000

Planned Bikeways

- Multnomah County
- Other




PORTLAND
PORTLAND AND VICINITY



PREPARED BY THE
OREGON STATE HIGHWAY DIVISION
IN COOPERATION WITH THE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
JUNE 1988

LEGEND

- | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| | INTERSTATE NUMBERED ROUTE | | POST OFFICE | | PUBLIC BUILDING |
| | U.S. NUMBERED ROUTE | | SCHOOL | | COURT HOUSE |
| | STATE NUMBERED ROUTE | | LIBRARY | | CITY HALL |
| | TERMINATION OF FA SYSTEM | | CITY LIMITS | | ARMORY |
| | DIVIDED HIGHWAY | | LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT STATION (TRI-MET) | | |
| | STREET OPEN FOR TRAVEL | | | | |



The 1990 Bikeway Plan Maps represent the comprehensive County bicycle network as planned. The designated facilities are to be preserved and improved over time to better accommodate bicycling. No warranty or guarantee is made, at this time, as to the suitability of the roadway condition or fitness of the route for bicycling. Modifications to the system will be made as conditions warrant.



Planned Bikeways


- Multnomah County
- Other

PORTLAND
 PORTLAND AND VICINITY


PREPARED BY THE
 OREGON STATE HIGHWAY DIVISION
 IN COOPERATION WITH THE
 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION


JUNE 1988

- LEGEND**
- | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| | INTERSTATE NUMBERED ROUTE | | POST OFFICE | | PUBLIC BUILDING |
| | U.S. NUMBERED ROUTE | | SCHOOL | | COURT HOUSE |
| | STATE NUMBERED ROUTE | | LIBRARY | | CITY HALL |
| | TERMINATION OF FA SYSTEM | | CITY LIMITS | | ARMORY |
| | DIVIDED HIGHWAY | | LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT STATION (TRI-MET) | | |
| | STREET OPEN FOR TRAVEL | | | | |



The 1990 Bikeway Plan Maps represent the comprehensive County bicycle network as planned. The designated facilities are to be preserved and improved over time to better accommodate bicycling. No warranty or guarantee is made, at this time, as to the suitability of the roadway condition or fitness of the route for bicycling. Modifications to the system will be made as conditions warrant.





MULTNOMAH COUNTY
 DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
 TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
 1620 S.E. 190th Ave. PORTLAND, ORE.
 1990 BICYCLE MASTER PLAN
 1990 BIKEWAY PLAN
 NORTHWEST MULTNOMAH COUNTY
 SCALE: 1" = 3000'



N

LEGEND

	MULTNOMAH COUNTY	OTHER JURISDICTIONS
Plan Bikeways		
1990 Additions		

The 1990 Bikeway Plan Maps represent the comprehensive County bicycle network as planned. The designated facilities are to be preserved and improved over time to better accommodate bicycling. No warranty or guarantee is made, at this time, as to the suitability of the roadway condition or fitness of the route for bicycling. Modifications to the system will be made as conditions warrant.

The 1990 Bikeway Plan Maps represent the comprehensive County bicycle network as planned. The designated facilities are to be preserved and improved over time to better accommodate bicycling. No warranty or guarantee is made, at this time, as to the suitability of the roadway condition or fitness of the route for bicycling. Modifications to the system will be made as conditions warrant.


MULTNOMAH COUNTY
 DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
 TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
 1620 S.E. 190th Ave. PORTLAND, ORE.
1990 BICYCLE MASTER PLAN

1990 BIKEWAY PLAN
 EAST COUNTY URBAN
 SCALE: 1" = 3000'
 1/2 0 1/2 1 MILE



LEGEND

	MULTNOMAH COUNTY	OTHER JURISDICTIONS
PLAN BIKEWAYS		
1990 ADDITIONS		



MULTNOMAH COUNTY
 CLACKAMAS COUNTY

My name is Jim Vann and I live at 21005 N.W. Sauvie Island Road. I have been authorized to speak for the Sauvie Island Grange #840, of which I am a member and past Master. We were misrepresented before the Multnomah County Planning Hearing on October 8th, 1990, which, also, was the night of our Grange meeting.

It was stated that at a Grange meeting, the Grange recommended putting the bike path along the bench of the dike. However, the meeting referred to was not a Grange meeting but an open meeting for the island sponsored by the Grange. All Grange business is transacted at our regular Grange meetings. The Grange never took such action then nor since then.

The Sauvie Island Grange #840 has been a positive force on Sauvie Island for 55 years, even before the days of the dike as the dike was completed in 1941. We know the importance of the dike to our way of life. The dike was constructed to keep the water off the island in order to make it more productive. Approximately 75 million pounds of produce is shipped yearly off the island plus milk, cattle and sheep, so Sauvie Island represents a productive contribution into the economy of the area.

The portion of dike being considered to be used as a bike path is 2 miles of the 17 miles of dike which protects 11,963 acres of the island. Presently, 11 hours every night, 7 days a week, until approximately next June, 750 thousand gallons of water is being pumped off the island every minute through the dike into the Multnomah Channel. Almost as much water is pumped off the island in one night as the whole city of Portland uses in 3 days. Therefore, you must realize, along with us, how important the dike is to us.

We know that people have been killed riding bicycles on this portion of the dike and it is a real threat to human lives. The Grange, therefore, recognizes and is totally in support of no one tampering with the dike system which is paramount in defense of our way of life, well being, and prosperity of everyone on Sauvie Island.

11/12/90

To the Mult. Co. Commissioners

I am unable to attend this meeting in person because I am still hospitalized because of recent back surgery, but I have a few thoughts I wish to convey.

As a representative from the Grange to the Sawvies Island Bicycle Task Force I made it very clear that the Grange at that time - early spring - had not taken a stand on this issue - whether to build a bike path on/around Sawvies Island - but that many of the members had come to me individually to speak against having a bike path built.

Their reasons were thoughtful and sincere - not just "I don't want it". I believe I shared these with the task force. I also informed the Task Force that the Grange was waiting to see what happened at our Task Force meetings before deciding to support the bike path or not.

As for the choice of the T.F. to locate the proposed bike path on the berm of the dike - this was Mr. Pickering's initial choice of places to start the path for reasons I'm certain he has made you aware. There were other areas of the Island which were suggested by members of the task force because of the safety issue and the much reduced cost of completing the project - but these areas were not included in the final plan.

As for Mr. Pickering's choice - the dike - everyone knows it is a hazard. But the plan to put a bike path there is not in my opinion a viable one now, because of various

problems which were not addressed by Mr. Pickering,

- 1/ The number of land owners who will be asked to give up their rights for ever for a small amt of money even tho they will still be required to pay taxes on this land.
- 2/ The fact that a nationally Registered Historic Indian Site would be destroyed by the implementation of the plan.
- 3/ The Drainage District was not consulted before the plan was proposed.
- 4/ The exit/entrance joint of the bike path at the Sawies Island moorage end of the dike would be a great hazard to both bikers and automobiles entering onto the dike. I have not satisfactorily been able to visualize how this exit can be accomplished with out disruption of the traffic pattern.
- 5/ The Berm floods periodically and besides making the bike path unusable during that time - there could be more chance for the main dike to wash.

Each of these is a "big deal" on it's own - together they become a formidable challenge to this proposal.

I felt 2 officially held meetings of the Task Force to be far from enough to address the many issues that were brought up. There were others I have not mentioned here

I do not say the report is totally wrong - but it is incomplete and misleading. In my opinion there was not unanimous approval of the Dike Bike path because too many questions remained to be answered.

Sincerely, Jack Brunner

Meeting Date: November 13, 1990

Agenda No.: #2

(Above space for Clerk's Office Use)

AGENDA PLACEMENT FORM
(For Non-Budgetary Items)

SUBJECT: Multnomah Cable Regulatory Commission's 1989-90 Annual Report

BCC Informal November 13, 1990 BCC Formal _____
(date) (date)

DEPARTMENT Non-Departmental DIVISION Chair Gladys McCoy

CONTACT Julie Omelchuck TELEPHONE 248-3576

PERSON(S) MAKING PRESENTATION Julie Omelchuck, MCRC Director

ACTION REQUESTED:

INFORMATIONAL ONLY POLICY DIRECTION APPROVAL

ESTIMATED TIME NEEDED ON BOARD AGENDA: 20 Minutes

CHECK IF YOU REQUIRE OFFICIAL WRITTEN NOTICE OF ACTION TAKEN: _____

BRIEF SUMMARY (include statement of rationale for action requested, as well as personnel and fiscal/budgetary impacts, if applicable):

Informational Briefing to Summarize the Multnomah Cable Regulatory Commission's 1989-90 Annual Report.

Requesting 9:30 Time Certain if Possible.

(If space is inadequate, please use other side)

SIGNATURES:

ELECTED OFFICIAL _____

or

DEPARTMENT MANAGER *[Signature]*

(All accompanying documents must have required signatures)

1990 NOV 13 PM 4:10
DINECON

MULTNOMAH CABLE REGULATORY COMMISSION

MULTNOMAH COUNTY, GRESHAM, FAIRVIEW, TROUTDALE AND WOOD VILLAGE

Commissioners:

Rodger Clawson, *President*
Ron Sherwood, *Vice President*
Margaret Templeton
Lee Moore
Mary Fournier

1120 SW 5th Avenue
Room 1430
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 248-3576

Julie S. Omelchuck, Director
Christina Witka, Cable Assistant

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Multnomah County Commissioners
FROM: Lee Moore, MCRC Representative
DATE: November 5, 1990
SUBJECT: MCRC Annual Report

Attached is the Multnomah Cable Regulatory Commission's 1989-90 Annual Report, the purpose of which is to summarize the MCRC's activities from July 1, 1989 to June 30, 1990.

The report is presented for your review as an informational item only: no action is requested of the Commission. Julie Omelchuck, Cable Regulatory Office Director, and I will attend the Commission meeting to answer any questions you may have.

1548T/JO/ld

MULTNOMAH CABLE REGULATORY COMMISSION

MULTNOMAH COUNTY, GRESHAM, FAIRVIEW, TROUTDALE AND WOOD VILLAGE

Commissioners:

Rodger Clawson, *President*
Ron Sherwood, *Vice President*
Margaret Templeton
Lee Moore
Mary Fournier

1120 SW 5th Avenue
Room 1430
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 248-3576

Julie S. Omelchuck, Director
Christina Witka, Cable Assistant

Multnomah Cable Regulatory Office Annual Report Fiscal Year 1989-90

In 1983, the Jurisdictions of Wood Village, Troutdale, Fairview, Gresham and Multnomah County formed the Multnomah Cable Regulatory Commission (MCRC) to manage and enforce cable television franchise agreements which allow Paragon Cable and Columbia Cable to operate in east Multnomah County and on Hayden Island respectively. To assist the MCRC in meeting its mandates, the Cable Regulatory Office staff, which included the Director and Cable Assistant, aspired to:

- ★ Enable the MCRC to make informed policy decisions.
- ★ Ensure that Paragon and Columbia complied with the spirit and letter of their franchise agreements.
- ★ Monitor Multnomah Cable Access Corporation (MCAC) and the Program in Community TV (PCTV) at Mt. Hood Community College to ensure that their activities met the goals as set forth in their contracts.
- ★ Address consumer issues ensuring that citizens received prompt, fair and courteous service from the cable companies.
- ★ Champion innovative community uses of cable so that citizens and institutions received maximum benefits from the capabilities of the cable system.

The MCRC adopted six objectives for FY 1989-90. The following contains highlights of activities the MCRC and/or staff undertook during the seventh year of operation to meet their objectives.

Objective 1: To address franchise issues and requirements in a timely manner.

- Monitored line extension policies which allow citizens of East County who reside outside the urban growth boundary (UGB) to receive cable service.
- Ensured those citizens within the UGB requesting cable service received it within 60 days of their requests.
- Reviewed and approved Paragon's Year 6 (1989) Annual Report which documents company compliance with franchise requirements. The review identified problem areas and the approval contained additional requirements in the areas of system technical performance, INET staffing and activity, and customer service.
- Conducted a live, call-in public hearing about the cable company's last three years' performance.
- Completed a six-month competitive bid process to allocate funds to support East County oriented, cable TV programming and conducted successful negotiations with the top applicant.
- Monitored Paragon's WBE/MBE and affirmative action percentages.
- Granted Paragon a one-time-only franchise variance regarding financial audits and reports.
- Reviewed Paragon's audit of franchise fee payments resulting in additional revenues to MCRC.
- Negotiated with Cable Company plan to improve picture quality and system technical performance which included a fiber optic trunk into East County by end of 1991.
- Reviewed Paragon's new tiering of cable programming services resulting in the Company waiving a \$25 downgrade charge for current customers.
- Reviewed Cable Company changes in service rates, program offerings and channel line-up to ensure adherence to franchise agreement.

Objective 2: To monitor Multnomah Cable Access Corporation for compliance with its contract.

- Appointed three MCAC Board members.
- Accepted MCAC's annual financial audit.
- Reviewed MCAC's quarterly activity and financial reports.

- Assisted MCAC staff with and gain Jurisdictional approval of the MCAC FY 1990-91 budget.
- Attended MCAC Board and staff planning retreat and Board of Directors' meetings.
- Approved FY 1989-90 budget amendment allowing MCAC to spend its carryover.
- Updated Board appointment interview questions.

Objective 3: To monitor the Program in Community Television for compliance with its contract.

- Accepted PCTV's annual activity and financial report.
- Participated on PCTV's Curriculum Advisory Committee.
- Assisted PCTV staff with and gained Jurisdictional approval of the PCTV FY 1990-91 budget.
- Approved FY 1989-90 budget amendment allowing PCTV to spend its carryover.

Objective 4: To operate the office to support the MCRC's mission and to comply with legal and administrative requirements.

- Prepared, approved and gained Jurisdictional approval of the MCRC's FY 1990-91 budget.
- Tracked investment of settlement funds.
- Compiled quarterly cable office financial reports.
- Prepared MCRC Annual Report.
- Participated in County division and departmental staff retreats and meetings.
- Refined staff development and performance evaluation plan.

Objective 5: To assure that consumer needs and inquires are answered.

- Responded to 100 calls and 12 letters representing 209 complaints in various categories (see attached chart).
- Published "A Consumer's Guide to Cable in East Multnomah."
- Provided monthly consumer complaint reports.

Objective 6: To explore innovative uses of the cable system's capabilities.

- Dedicated \$30,000 of the MCRC's annual budget to the Public Demonstration Fund with the purpose of assisting public agencies or schools to develop successful uses of the cable system.
- Approved Public Development Fund standards and procedures to allocate and review requests from jurisdictions for cable company funds.
- Participated, as attendees and speakers, in three national conventions: the National Federation of Local Cable Programmers (NFLCP), the National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors (NATOA) and the National Cable Television Association (NCTA).
- Served on the regional NFLCP Board of Directors.
- Chaired the Local Planning Committee for the 1991 NFLCP National Convention to be held in Portland, July 24-26.

1497T/JO/js

CABLE OFFICE COMPLAINTS
JULY 1989 - JUNE 1990

TOTAL NUMBER	JULY	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT.	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	TOTAL
Calls	6	6	4	3	5	1	10	4	23	14	7	5	88
Letters	0	1	2	1	1	3	1	1	0	1	1	0	12
<u>Complaint Category</u>													
Installation/Repair	2	3	2	3	3	2	8	3	6	4	3	1	40
Reception	1	4	1	1	0	2	4	2	7	3	0	0	25
Billing/Disconnect	1	1	1	3	4	3	3	1	4	1	1	1	24
Phones/Busy Lines	1	2	1	1	3	0	8	2	1	2	0	0	19
Public Relations	3	2	1	5	3	2	5	2	6	7	3	0	39
No Service in ISA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Rate Increase	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	7	5	0	33
Programming	2	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	8
Franchise Fee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	4
Other	0	2	1	1	0	4	3	0	2	2	0	1	16
Total by Category	10	16	9	14	14	14	33	10	48	27	13	4	209

This chart represents 100 persons calling in a total of 209 complaints for FY 89-90.

Prepared: July 1990

17C2/cw