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What is Cathedral Mobility?

The Cathedral Mobility plan is a toolbox to help the Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association (CPNA) coordinate with PBOT and effectively advocate for walking, biking, rolling, and bus improvements in the area. The recommendations focus on achieving two goals in and around the proposed Mixed-Use Urban Center (MU-UC):

1. Improving access up and down the hill that stretches from Ivanhoe St. to the Willamette River.
2. Improving safety and connectivity by providing adequate space and facilities for pedestrians and bicycle riders.

These recommendations are based on extensive public outreach, stakeholder interviews, and professional expertise.

How Cathedral Mobility works with citywide planning efforts:

Cathedral Mobility integrates with other city plans and initiatives. Recommendations are designed to align with the City's long-term planning priorities and support future investments in major projects. Coordinated citywide plans include:

- **2035 Comprehensive Plan**'s Mixed Use-Urban Center designation highlights urban, pedestrian-oriented areas with a mix of commercial, employment, and public service uses, a wide variety of housing options, and access to frequent bus service.
- **PedPDX**, Portland’s citywide pedestrian master plan, has analyzed the sidewalk and crossing-spacing gaps on Cathedral Park streets and recommends an implementation priority for those gaps. Cathedral Mobility recommendations largely align with PedPDX needs addressing key pedestrian gaps in a permanent or interim fashion.
- **Bicycle Plan for 2030** advocates for bicycling as an important and necessary form of travel. It recommends actions and capital projects that support people's interests in bicycling. Our recommendations support this vision and the suggested projects. Some of our recommendations diverge from this plan, but with good cause.
The community’s role in Cathedral Mobility

Community members played a central role in this project. Their feedback was the foundation upon which these recommendations were built.

Residents reported their most important issues, where the most troubling areas are, and what the most appropriate treatments to address them are. This report is a showcase for the experiences and ideas of Cathedral Park community members.

How this plan can be used:

*Cathedral Mobility* provides CPNA and PBOT with information, insights, and analysis that will move several projects forward along their respective timelines.

**Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association**

The *Cathedral Mobility* plan can be used in two ways: as an Advocacy Tool and as a Road Map.

**Advocacy Tool** - The neighborhood association will be able to use this plan to effectively advocate to PBOT and other agencies for needed transportation investments. From the very start of this project, PBOT stressed that for projects to be implementable, they had to have strong public support. By using the community feedback and the experts’ input we received, CPNA can build a case for PBOT that demonstrates the viability of these projects.

**Road Map** - Some of the solutions in *Cathedral Mobility*, such as developing a Parking Management District, will require long, complicated processes to implement. For these particular solutions, we have provided both detailed descriptions of the necessary first steps as well as useful contacts. This road map will make complicated processes more manageable.

**Portland Bureau of Transportation**

It is important for PBOT to know the kind of improvements the community prioritizes and how this information was obtained. PBOT can use that information to more effectively choose which projects to move forward with and how best to tailor their own community outreach efforts.
Baltimore Ave. near Cathedral Park
The Cathedral Park Neighborhood is a wonderful area to live with beautiful parks and a vibrant commercial center. Unfortunately, the current transportation infrastructure makes it difficult to access everything this neighborhood has to offer without a car. A few of the transportation issues with which current residents must contend are:

• The neighborhood has no bike lanes or marked crosswalks.
• Several streets dead-end because of steep terrain issues.
• The steepness also makes it difficult or impossible for many people, including older persons or people with disabilities, to access the river and Cathedral Park.
• Many streets are unpaved and uncomfortable to use.
• Bus service is too infrequent and takes too long to get to key destinations.

_Cathedral Mobility_ addresses these concerns, but it also looks to anticipate future changes. Cathedral Park and St. Johns are growing, with denser development, population growth, increased congestion, and a need for more transportation options. For instance, the City’s 2035 Comprehensive Plan recently designated the low-density, mainly industrial area at the bottom of the hill as a Mixed Use-Urban Center (MU-UC). The intent of this zoning designation is to concentrate denser residential and commercial growth in town centers instead of spreading it over the entire region. The increase in people working and living at the bottom of the hill will likely intensify the need for improvements to the local transportation network.

**VISION STATEMENT FOR CATHEDRAL MOBILITY**

When traveling, Cathedral Park residents and visitors of all ages and abilities should be able to easily and safely walk, bike, roll, and ride the bus to access their daily needs.
The Role of Cathedral Mobility

The current transportation network does not accommodate the active transportation needs for the current residents, much less those expected to come along with future development. However, according to developers, increased development within the MU-UC is still many years away. We have identified several affordable, relatively simple solutions that can be implemented to greatly improve current conditions, as well as more ambitious solutions that address future concerns.

The goal of this project is to first define and prioritize the transportation needs of the community through public engagement and outside professional insights. We then provide tools, guidance, and recommendations for both CPNA and the City to use to effectively address those needs.
Existing Conditions

The Cathedral Park neighborhood is largely dominated by steep topography as well as a lack of sidewalks, crosswalks and bike infrastructure. These features collectively pose significant mobility challenges for those walking, biking or using a mobility device.

Study Area

The Cathedral Park neighborhood is located along the waterfront on the city’s north peninsula, just south of St. Johns. The neighborhood is mostly residential, with some light industrial activity and natural areas near the waterfront.

The steep topography of the Cathedral Park Neighborhood presents unique challenges for walking, biking, using a mobility device, and accessing transit.

While this project involved the entirety of Cathedral Park and some of St. Johns, the central focus was on the area around the MU-UC from the river to downtown St. Johns. The focus of this project came to include Ivanhoe St., the barrier between the neighborhoods, and Willamette Blvd. based on community feedback.
A History of Growth

Land claims in the late 19th century established the boundaries that eventually became the present day street grid. By 1904, a streetcar system encouraged rapid growth and pedestrian-oriented development in many Portland neighborhoods including St. Johns. Railroad and industrial growth also became a trend early in the 20th Century and continued well into the mid-1900s. The opening of the St. Johns bridge in 1931 replaced the city’s last ferry and provided easy vehicle access coinciding with the widespread increase in popularity of automobiles from the 20th Century and beyond.

Neighborhood activism began to gain momentum in the 1970s as a result of years of industrial pollution and a lack of green spaces in the neighborhood. By 1981, the abandoned industrial space under the bridge was officially designated as a park following much pressure and activism from the neighborhood. Cathedral City Park has since grown into one of North Portland iconic open space parks, hosting the annual Cathedral Park Jazz Festival.
Demographics & Equity Considerations

The Cathedral Park neighborhood has a slightly higher share of renters than the city of Portland, as well as higher average income. The neighborhood’s share of people of color (PoC) is significantly lower than the City’s. The neighborhood has a slightly higher share of older residents (65+) and a significantly lower share of younger residents (17 and under).

This data is also collected and contextualized at the city-wide level through PBOT’s Equity Matrix and are indexed relative to one another. Demographic indicators are scored a numerical value from 2 to 10 allowing for broad comparisons between neighborhoods. Higher values indicate a higher share of the population who identify as low-income or a person of color. LEP stands for Limited English Proficiency.

While the Equity Matrix is a valuable tool to guide investments at the citywide level, the neighborhood is too small an area to draw conclusions based solely on equity score differential. Cathedral Mobility took a smaller-scale approach to evaluate equity concerns. This is explained in more detail in Chapter 4: Treatment Identification & Evaluation and in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Cathedral Park</th>
<th>City of Portland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>4,317</td>
<td>630,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Person of Color</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$69,912</td>
<td>$61,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Renters</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Living in Poverty</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent 17 and Under</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent 65 and Older</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ACS 5-Year estimates 2013-2017
**Walkways**

PedPDX and the Transportation System Plan (TSP) have both identified pedestrian networks throughout the project study area. Many of the streets are currently unpaved and/or not maintained. A significant proportion of these streets lack sidewalks on one or both sides, which contributes to an unsafe environment for those traveling by foot.

The existing walkway networks outlined in these plans consist of a number of the neighborhood’s primary developed roads, as well as the St. Johns Bridge and Philadelphia Ave. Both PedPDX and the TSP also include the yet to be completed sections of the North Portland Greenway Trail.

**Bikeways**

The City of Portland has many miles of bicycle-friendly roads, but Cathedral Park currently contains almost none. There are a few routes just outside the neighborhood, but none reach into the neighborhood. According to residents, this lack of bicycle infrastructure contributes to a stressful biking experience, especially for less experienced riders.

The TSP identifies both Lombard St. and the currently unfinished North Portland Greenway as Major City Bikeways, with a network of lesser bikeways on neighborhood streets like Willamette Blvd. and the St. Johns bridge. There is currently no planned route that connects the bottom of the hill to the top.
Transit

The neighborhood is relatively well served by five TriMet bus lines, including frequent service routes 4 and 75. These two lines provide access to the MAX light rail system, the Rose Quarter, Lloyd Center, and to neighborhoods in North and Northeast Portland. Lines 4 and 16 serve key job centers, including downtown. Line 16 is primarily a commuter bus and it can be the fastest way to get to the center of the city without a car. However, this line can be significantly delayed by freight rail activity in the NW industrial area. Line 11 provides critical weekday service to Columbia Blvd. and Marine Dr., providing access to heavy industrial properties and other important employers.

The Schrunk Riverview Tower, a 55+ low-income apartment building run by Home Forward, is served directly by line 4. This line provides local access to a major grocery store (Safeway), downtown St. Johns, and the post office. TriMet’s North Central Service Enhancement Plan includes plans for increasing Line 4’s hours of operations.
Travel Behavior

A smaller portion of Cathedral Park residents use active transportation modes and transit to get to work or school than the city as a whole.

More people drive alone or carpool to work in Cathedral Park (75%) than in Portland as a whole (66%). One possible explanation of this is the fact that the neighborhood is relatively isolated from the city center and the majority of the region’s jobs.

However, in the past few decades, the proportion of residents using active transportation modes has increases significantly for the city as a whole and the neighborhood in particular.
People Working from Home
+129 trips (+1600%)

Other
+19 trips

People Driving
+893 trips (+88%)
Planning Context

There are many adopted and ongoing policies, programs, and projects that informed the Cathedral Mobility planning process. Some policies serve as the origin for the projects outlined in this plan. Some of the most important policies include:

- **Metro’s Region 2040 Growth Concept**
  Metro’s Region 2040 Growth Concept was adopted by Metro in late 1994 and establishes policies that encourage safe and stable neighborhoods, compact development inside the Urban Growth Boundary, protection of farms, water systems and nature, a balanced transportation system, and housing for all income levels.

- **St. Johns Truck Strategy**
  This plan recommends ways to resolve conflicts between truck traffic and pedestrians and bicycle riders in residential and commercial areas in St. Johns while recognizing the important role of freight to local, regional and state economies.

- **St. Johns Lombard Plan**
  The St. Johns Lombard Plan made specific amendments to the Portland Comprehensive Plan and zoning code.

- **Portland Freight Plan**
  The Portland Freight Plan establishes three main goals of mobility, livability and economy. It aims to improve the transportation system for all modes of freight, reduce the impact of freight on communities, encourage the co-existence of freight with other modes, and recognize the role of freight in supporting healthy and vibrant business centers. The plan calls for improvements to several key intersections which lie on freight routes in the Cathedral Park Neighborhood.

- **Portland Bicycle Plan for 2030**
  The 2030 Bike Plan identifies a comprehensive bicycle network for the entire City of Portland. The plan calls for “world-class” strategies to improve bicycle access in Cathedral Park. The plan refers to a number of key streets in our plan, marking them as Future Separated In-Roadway or Future Bike Boulevard routes.
Fixing Our Streets
The Fixing Our Streets program is the result of 2016’s Measure 26-173. It is the first local funding source dedicated to fixing Portland’s streets and is slated to raise an estimated $64 million over four years. Fixing Our Streets helps PBOT expand maintenance to a number of locations in the Cathedral Park Neighborhood, such as repairs to structural failures that help prevent their spread.

Vision Zero Action Plan
This action plan takes an equitable and data-driven approach to eliminating deaths and serious injuries on Portland’s streets by 2025. Lombard St., which is slightly outside of the Cathedral Park Neighborhood, is included in Vision Zero’s High Crash Networks. However, crash rates on sections of the road near the neighborhood are relatively low compared to other problem sections of Lombard St.

Comprehensive and Transportation System Plan
City Council adopted the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and Transportation System Plan which sets ambitious targets to increase and prioritize walking, biking, and transit trips throughout the City of Portland.

Safe Routes to School
Safe Routes to School (SRTS) is a partnership between the City of Portland, schools, neighborhoods, agencies and community organizations that advocate for and implement programs to encourage students to walk and bike.

PedPDX, Portland’s Citywide Pedestrian Plan
PedPDX is Portland’s citywide pedestrian plan. It prioritizes sidewalk and crossing improvements and other investments to make walking safer and more comfortable across the city. The plan identifies key strategies and tools to help make Portland a great walking city for everyone.
Hello, Neighbor!

Have you ever had a hard time walking, biking, and taking the bus around the neighborhood?

Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association is working with Portland State planning students to look for ways to make it easier to walk, ride a bicycle, and use transit in the area, and we would like your help by answering a few questions.

Please go to www.cathedralkparkd.org and take a five-minute survey. Included is a map to record specific trouble spots.

Or, scan the QR code.

Thank you!

Questions?
Contact: Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association
Email: communications@cathedralkparkd.org

Door Hanger Survey Invitation
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Community Engagement

Community member participation was a critical component of this project. The plan’s strength comes from the support of those impacted by it. We incorporated strong feedback from the community into context-sensitive recommendations. A comprehensive Public Involvement Report can be found in Appendix A.

Community Engagement Summary

The project team used a variety of strategies to reach residents, making a special effort to reach under-represented community members. These strategies included:

• **Using a variety of mapping tools and techniques.** These included an online map, a large shared map used in several events, and personal route maps. These tools helped to highlight specific areas and issues to be addressed.

• **Multiple Surveys.** We asked residents general questions about their attitudes and experiences and also about specific treatments for specific locations.

• **Hosting an Open House.** We presented initial results of the first survey and online map and asked for feedback on potential treatments.

• **Hosting workshops.** We met with residents at a low-income, 55+ apartment complex in the center of the neighborhood to review draft recommendations. We then asked community members to review and refine these recommendations during CPNA’s monthly meeting.

• **Consulting with a Technical Advisory Committee.** We met with this committee twice to ensure our plans were feasible and met City and State standards.

• **Interviewing stakeholders.** Industry experts and community leaders provided useful information about patterns and activities within the study area and suggested solutions that have worked in similar situations.
To maximize public response, we advertised events and surveys on social media outlets like Facebook and Nextdoor as well as CPNA’s website. Fliers were placed at prominent locations throughout the community. We were sure to advertise in the business district outside the neighborhood as well, because it is frequented regularly by Cathedral Park residents.

There were varying levels of response and attendance throughout the project. However, consistent themes and attitudes emerge when everything is considered together.

Overall, response to our recommendations was very positive. Residents are interested in improving active transportation conditions in the area and they were supportive of these proposals. Residents also appear to desire more changes than are being proposed here. The scope of this project was limited, and we were not able to incorporate every suggestion. The area is ripe for further outreach and improvement.

Residents were able to give feedback and comments through a variety of activities. Pictured here is a multi-tiered voting game.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT TIMELINE
Surveys

Survey 1 - Attitudes and Experiences
3.11.2019 - 4.02.2019

Our initial survey centered around asking residents about their experiences and desires regarding getting around the neighborhood without a car. We asked residents about the travel modes they used besides personal vehicles, what they experienced as barriers to using these and other modes, and what, if anything, would encourage them to use them more.

Survey 1 was given both in person and online. We performed intercept and door-to-door surveys along streets we and members of the Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association Board initially identified as potential focal points for improvements. Door hangers introducing the project to the neighborhood and advertising an online version of the survey were placed on nearly every door in the neighborhood. The online version also included an online map where people could make location-specific comments about the same issues. We received a high volume of responses and while the results were approximately what we expected, there were a few surprises.

Survey 2 - Locations and Treatments
5.07.2019 - 5.28.2019

Once we had a picture of what residents were experiencing and wanting, we narrowed our focus to the locations and issues that showed up most consistently. Surveys seemed to be an effective means of outreach, so we designed a second one based on what we heard from our first survey, the first TAC meeting, interviews, and the open house. The second survey paired locations with specific issues and treatments. The goal was to get a sense of what kinds of improvements residents prioritized, the level of investment they were willing to support, and the particular locations they preferred these to go. We did not get as many responses as the first survey, but the information we received was informative and useful.
Open House - Portland Baha’i Center
3.30.2019

We invited residents to find out more about the project and asked them provide additional feedback. Results of the first survey were presented for people to view and they were invited to make comments. People were asked to build upon the map exercise from that survey by placing stickers on a large, shared map to show locations of specific issues. They were also given personal map handouts to record where they bike and walk and where they would like to but don’t feel comfortable enough to do so.

This took place during an early stage of the project, and we took advantage of the opportunity to build towards specific recommendations in specific locations. We gave residents a chance to vote for treatments they thought would be the most beneficial to the neighborhood. This information played a significant role in creating our initial draft recommendations.

Workshops

Schrunk Riverview Tower
5.09.2019

It was important that we spoke with people most affected by the issues touched on by the project, especially those we hadn’t heard from by this point. One such group was older residents. We were less likely to come across older residents during our intercept surveys and outreach events, so we reached out specifically to the 55 and older community of Schrunk Riverview Tower. We asked for feedback on our draft recommendations using workbooks specially designed for older persons, featuring large font typesetting and high-contrast graphics. These proved to be successful as a tool for us to work in groups, though some participants chose to fill them out on their own. This workshop also built capacity in the community by having Anna Bannanas, a local cafe, cater the event. This cafe is popular with the residents, and it happened to be the first time they had ever catered an event.

Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association Monthly Meeting, BES Water Lab
(05.14.2019)

We asked residents to look over specific recommendations in a workbook similar to the Schrunk Tower workshop. People discussed the issues they experience getting around the neighborhood without a car and how these issues intersect with our proposals. This event was held in conjunction with Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association’s monthly meeting and all were welcome. This had the largest turnout of our events with about 18 attendees.
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
2.28.2019, 5.09.2019

We asked several experts to help steer the project towards a plan that is practical, sustainable, and implementable. The group was composed of PBOT staff, a planning consultant, and an environmental gerontologist from PSU. The TAC met twice, once early in the project to ensure that the foundation was in place and the team had a clear course ahead. We received critical feedback about what is feasible in a challenging area.

The intent of the second meeting was to vet our initial recommendations with an eye towards improving the recommendations and lending them the weight of expert opinion. This was also an important opportunity to further refine our alternatives into their final forms.

TAC Members

Andrew Aebi, Local Improvement District Administrator, PBOT
April Bertelsen, Senior Transportation Planner, PBOT
Alan De La Torre, PhD, Institute on Aging, Portland State University
Nick Falbo, Senior Transportation Planner, PBOT
Bob Hillier, Freight Coordinator, PBOT
Taylor Phillips, Associate Planner, PBOT
Mike Sellinger, Senior Planner, Alta Planning + Design
Mike Serritella, Transportation Planner, PBOT
Zef Wagner, Transportation Planner II, PBOT
Stakeholder Interviews

We talked with several community and business leaders about how residents interact with certain locations and how they interpret the needs of the community. We learned a great many things that would be difficult to gain solely from surveys and community events. The insights from these interviews were instrumental in developing our survey questions and recommendations.

**Interviewees**

Andrew Aebi, Local Improvement District Administrator, PBOT
Alan De La Torre, PhD, Institute on Aging, Portland State University
Cole Grisham, Senior Transportation Planner, ODOT
Zachary Horowitz, P.E., Multimodal Transportation Engineer, ODOT
Lindsay Jensen, Executive Director, St. Johns Center for Opportunity
Brett Kesterson, Civil Engineer, PBOT (retired)
Mason Marsh, PTA President, James John Elementary
Heather McCrary, Executive Director, Explore Washington Park
Betsy Valle, Secretary, Friends of Baltimore Woods
Themes

Several key themes emerged early on and remained consistent throughout the *Cathedral Mobility* project. These were expressed in different ways, but the important issues remained clear. A complete list of themes is included in Appendix A.

**Safety**

Safety was one of the most common issues we heard about, in a variety of contexts. It became a central focus of this project and it plays an important role in most of our recommendations.

**Pedestrian Needs**

In Cathedral Park, people walk, and because they do, the limitations of the pedestrian infrastructure are all the more apparent. People want crossing improvements, even more than we were able to suggest. They want sidewalk gaps filled in. We expected gaps that only affect one side of the street to not be a major priority, but the community said otherwise.

**Bike Needs**

Residents made it clear that although bicycle ridership in the neighborhood is relatively low, the interest in it is high. They conveyed the impression of a group of people just waiting for the right conditions to become an active transportation hub.

**Transit Needs**

Community members let us know that while in some ways the neighborhood is well served by transit, in other critical ways, it is not. We expected to hear more about bus stop locations, but what we did hear is that service to downtown has serious issues, especially during peak times. Buses do not have enough capacity for bicycles and mobility devices and Line 16 has a propensity for getting delayed behind freight trains in the NW industrial area. These inconveniences make it difficult for people to leave their cars at home.

**Busy Streets**

Busy streets were not initially a major target for our evaluation, but community members quickly made it clear that this was a pressing issue.

We were not able to complete a full traffic analysis of the neighborhood, and so recommendations relate to issues on key neighborhood streets, as well as better ways to cross Ivanhoe St.
Railroad crossing near Cathedral Park Place
CHAPTER 4

Treatment Identification & Evaluation

The central goal of this plan is to identify the community’s needs and desires regarding active transportation in and around Cathedral Park Neighborhood and design improvements that address them.

Draft Recommendations

The multi-stage outreach campaign first asked community members about their general needs and desires regarding getting around without a car. Later we asked them about specific locations and treatments for addressing issues we heard. This information was combined with an existing conditions analysis and advice from the Technical Advisory Committee to create draft recommendations.

Evaluation Criteria

We would have liked to develop a Stakeholder Advisory Committee to create evaluation and prioritization criteria, but time and resources made this infeasible. Instead, we referenced an example from PBOT that was used in the Southwest In Motion project and referenced industry best practices to create an evaluation matrix specific to this project.

While potentially imprecise as a measure of Cathedral Park residents’ interests, the evaluation matrix created is useful in identifying treatments that stand out, as well as those that need to be reconsidered.

The matrix on the next page shows how each treatment we considered measures against the others within the same issue. The combined scores are not precise measurements of value but rather relative comparisons. A 4.8 for one issue does not necessarily have a relationship with a 4.8 from a different issue. However, a 5.1 compared to a 4.2 within the same issue should be considered an important difference.
## Evaluation Matrix

### The Hill Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria: Weighted Score Range</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Legibility</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Ease of Implementation</th>
<th>Shared Needs</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Shuttle</td>
<td>10 10 5 10 5 5 3 3 3 5 3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funicular</td>
<td>10 5 10 3 3 3 1 1 3 1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Bike Share</td>
<td>1 1 5 3 5 5 5 5 5 3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Walkway</td>
<td>10 5 10 3 3 1 1 1 3 1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switchback</td>
<td>10 5 10 5 3 3 1 1 1 5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs</td>
<td>5 10 1 1 3 1 1 1 5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bicycle Rider Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria: Weighted Score Range</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Legibility</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Ease of Implementation</th>
<th>Shared Needs</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Greenway</td>
<td>5 10 10 5 5 5 5 1 1 3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison Greenway</td>
<td>5 10 5 3 3 5 5 5 5 3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse Greenway</td>
<td>5 10 5 3 5 5 5 5 5 3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton Greenway</td>
<td>5 10 5 3 5 5 5 5 5 3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Cycle Track</td>
<td>10 5 10 5 5 3 1 1 1 3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Bike Lane/Sharrows</td>
<td>10 10 5 5 5 5 5 5 1 3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Bike Lane/Sharrows</td>
<td>5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 1 3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pedestrian Needs Crossings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria: Weighted Score Range</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Legibility</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Ease of Implementation</th>
<th>Shared Needs</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willamette and Richmond</td>
<td>10 10 5 5 5 5 3 3 5 5 5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe West</td>
<td>5 10 5 5 5 5 3 5 3 5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe and John</td>
<td>1 10 10 5 5 5 1 1 3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe and Charleston</td>
<td>1 5 10 3 3 5 1 1 3 3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe and Leavitt</td>
<td>1 5 10 3 3 5 1 1 3 3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>10 10 5 5 5 3 3 3 3 5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>5 5 10 5 3 3 3 3 3 5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Switchback</td>
<td>10 5 10 5 5 1 1 1 5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BusyStreets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria: Weighted Score Range</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Legibility</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Ease of Implementation</th>
<th>Shared Needs</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse Diverters</td>
<td>10 1 10 5 3 5 5 1 5 5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radar Speed Sign</td>
<td>5 10 5 5 3 5 5 3 3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Speed Humps</td>
<td>10 5 5 5 3 1 3 5 5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Rumble Strips</td>
<td>5 10 5 5 3 5 5 3 1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transit Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria: Weighted Score Range</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Legibility</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Ease of Implementation</th>
<th>Shared Needs</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line 16 Express</td>
<td>10 10 10 3 5 5 1 5 3 5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reroute</td>
<td>10 5 5 5 5 3 5 1 3 5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CATHEDRAL MOBILITY PLAN**

**CHAPTER 5**

# Project Recommendations

*Cathedral Mobility* is building upon the existing active transportation network, adding important new elements, filling in gaps in existing elements, and making streets safer for all users.

## Categories

*Cathedral Mobility* treatments are categorized by specific issues identified by community members and stakeholders. Treatments are designed to address specific issues, although several serve a combination of them.

Prioritized recommendations are those that are relatively easy to implement and may not require extensive further community or bureaucratic process, such as locations for crossing improvements.

Some recommendations will require more complicated paths toward implementation, such as additional analysis, forming advisory committees, and navigating City or State legal processes. Information about these is provided to help CPNA target the people with whom to partner and the first few steps to take to advance safety and mobility goals.

## Relationship to the Transportation System Plan

Cathedral Mobility projects are designed to take advantage of lower-cost, short-term and longer-term implementation opportunities. These projects are not intended to supersede or replace major projects in the Transportation System Plan (TSP). In some cases, treatment are interim or partial implementation of larger TSP projects designed to incrementally improve our streets.

## Issues

There are 5 central issues identified in this project as well as a topic brought to us by PBOT that is important to the neighborhood:

1. The Hill
2. Busy Streets
3. Bicycle Rider Needs
4. Pedestrian Needs
5. Transit Needs

**Topic: Local Improvement District Implementation**

We have designed several recommendations to address these issues:

- Circulator Shuttle
- Parking Management District
- Traffic Diverters
- Neighborhood Greenways
- Electric Bike-Share
- New Sidewalks
- Switchback
- Curb Extensions
- All-Way Stop
- Highway Redesignation
- Bus Express Route
- Outreach Campaign

In addition, there are several alternatives in consideration of different scenarios.
ISSUE 1:  
THE HILL

Steep slopes on several streets create significant barriers for many users. Our goal is to create better ways for residents to reach the top of the hill, downtown St Johns, and the rest of the city without a car.

We heard a wide range of comments from residents regarding the hill, from those for whom it keeps from bicycling at all, to a few older residents who use mobility devices who don’t see the hill as a problem at all.

Burlington St., Richmond Ave., and Baltimore Ave. were the most commonly referenced streets for hill issues. All three stretch from the river to the center of St. Johns.

We also looked for routes that circumvent the main hill by winding a way along streets with more gradual slopes. Unfortunately, every alternate route has at least one major barrier that keeps it from being an ideal choice to avoid the hill. Because of this, we focused on mechanized means to help people get up the hill directly. We also recognize Crawford St. as the best alternate, around-the-hill, route later in the recommendation relating to the LID, on page 27.

---

**Steep Slopes**
We recommend a circulator shuttle to serve current and future hill-related needs at a lower cost than other options. It has broad community support, addresses safety, equity, and fits well within the existing transit and active transportation networks. It can take a few different forms:

**Local Route:** A 1.5-mile loop that connects several central Cathedral Park destinations. There would be one driver and one vehicle making a loop about every 12 minutes or so, making it less expensive with more frequent and reliable service.

**Regional Route:** This would extend further out into the peninsula to connect to more destinations and job centers. This would be more expensive to implement due to more vehicles and drivers, but it would attract more riders.

**On-Demand Service Area:** Residents can arrange for pick-up or drop-off at most locations within the service area via telephone, website, or app. This would work in combination with either of the fixed route options. Hybrid service provides a balance between consistent, frequent service, and the inclusiveness of serving most area residents.

The specific route of the shuttle, the destinations it would serve, and the service schedule will be determined through future community engagement processes.
Parking Management District

We recommend the Cathedral Park and St. Johns Neighborhoods begin the process of establishing a Parking Management District (PMD) as a way to fund the circulator shuttle and other local transportation investments.

A PMD allows the community, the business associations, and the City to collaborate and manage parking usage as well as generate revenue for local transportation improvements---such as the circulator shuttle, fixing cracked sidewalks, curb ramps and more. In 2014, PBOT conducted a study that determined that the St. Johns and Cathedral Park neighborhoods would be viable locations for a Parking Management District. Establishing a parking district can be a long process, but the steps are clearly laid out in the Portland Parking Management Manual (2018). The first few steps are:

• Step 1: Have your business association submit a letter of interest to Chris Armes in the Parking Operations division in PBOT (chris.armes@portlandoregon.gov).

• Step 2: Establish preliminary district boundaries.

• Step 3: Form a Parking Advisory Committee (PAC) with a minimum of five members consisting of business owners/representatives and residents of the district.

• From there, PBOT will work with your PAC to collect data and perform analysis to determine a parking strategy.

The Executive Director of Explore Washington Park, Heather McCrary, operates a successful circulator shuttle that connects Washington Park visitors to the MAX station, the International Rose Garden, the Zoo, and other destinations. She told us that the contract is the most important aspect of the circulator and should be finalized prior to any revenue generation. The contract specifies the division and use of all revenue deriving from the shuttle.

PBOT notes that parking management, not revenue, should be a PMD’s primary purpose. The demand for a PMD will be evaluated in the latter steps of its development. A PMD is worth pursuing whether for the sake of parking management, funding a shuttle, or both.

Future Shuttle Considerations

Cost constraints may limit the feasible technology options at first, but we recommend that the stakeholders of the parking management district look to incorporate electric vehicles once the route is well established. This would help advance the City’s goals for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. Autonomous vehicles should also be considered once the technology has become readily available and proven.
RowanWood Planning staff worked with PBOT on a mapping project in preparation of the implementation of a Local Improvement District (LID) in the center of the neighborhood. We were asked to create a map that can be used to help build relationships with neighbors.

This map will show the relative difficulty (cost) of improving streets within the LID, block by block, plus the willingness of the property owners affected by the LID to redevelop their property.

Managing expectations is an important part of the LID process. PBOT plans to use this map to make connections between reluctant property owners and low-cost improvements and between enthusiastic property owners and more comprehensive improvements. The design of the street will be completed through a community-driven process.

We have completed the relative-cost-to-develop portion of the map, and we recommend that CPNA complete the map by working with PBOT to coordinate and conduct interviews with property owners to determine their willingness to develop or redevelop their property. Experience gained in this process can be translated into future LIDs for sidewalks and other recommendations made later in this report.

**Hill Issues**

In an adjacent part of the neighborhood, we identified a less steep path up the hill that could be improved to provide an easier, though more out of the way, route to walk, bike, and roll around the hill. The path uses Crawford St. traveling southeast to Tyler St. where it turns northeast to Willamette Blvd where people can connect to the 44 bus and the neighborhood greenway. Crawford St. is largely unpaved, so we worked with PBOT to perform a similar cost-to-develop evaluation to the one we did for the LID. We recommend CPNA again conduct interviews with property owners, though these would initially focus on their willingness to establish a new LID as opposed to redeveloping their property.
ISSUE 2: BUSY STREETS

ISSUE 3: BICYCLE RIDER NEEDS

One of the highest priority issues for Cathedral Park residents is busy streets. Many people mentioned issues relating to traffic volumes and speeds on collector and neighborhood streets.

Community members also expressed a desire for better bicycle facilities. There is a strong interest in bike riding but few actually do it due to a number of factors, an important one being the safety and comfort of many streets.

These two issues and their treatments are closely intertwined and therefore are addressed here together.

Conflicts

There is broad support for bicycle facilities and calmer, safer streets, but when community members were presented with treatments that significantly impact parking and car access to and from the bridge, the we received considerable pushback.

We have worked to incorporate these concerns into our recommendations, but it appears that a final decision about addressing these issues may not be able to satisfy all residents equally.

When the City acts on these recommendations and engages with the community themselves, they should anticipate a complex nexus of conflicting interests.

Alternatives

In this vein, we have created alternatives to the central recommendation, reflecting different levels of community support for neighborhood changes. These represent a spectrum of tradeoffs to help the City find the right balance for this community. We recommend:

- Traffic diverters on Syracuse St. and a neighborhood greenway on Willamette Blvd.
- If that is too disruptive, we recommend a two-way cycle track on Willamette Blvd.
- If neither of those are the right changes, we recommend a neighborhood greenway on Edison St.
RECOMMENDATION 1: TRAFFIC DIVERTERS & NEIGHBORHOOD GREENWAYS

We recommend installing diverters on both sides of Syracuse St. where it meets Philadelphia Ave. This will prevent drivers from entering or exiting the St. Johns bridge, except at the Ivanhoe St. intersection. Community members report that drivers are using Willamette Blvd. and other neighborhood streets to bypass Ivanhoe St., which increases traffic volumes and speeds on streets intended to act as local service traffic streets. These also happen to be the ideal streets for pedestrian and bicycle routes. Without the incentive of bridge access from the neighborhood, we anticipate that most bridge traffic will reroute to Ivanhoe, reducing local street volumes and speeds.

The City will need to analyze the impacts of additional traffic on Ivanhoe St. before installing anything permanent. The active transportation improvements recommended in this report may alleviate some of this traffic, but this needs to be studied further.

Design

Syracuse diverters will restrict traffic flow, allowing neighborhood traffic to use Philadelphia Ave. to reach downtown St. Johns, but they force eastbound bridge traffic to use Ivanhoe St. Similarly, traffic originating in downtown St. Johns can still access the neighborhood via Syracuse St. at the entrance to the north of Philadelphia Ave., but western neighborhood traffic looking to access the bridge will have to use Ivanhoe St. The minor Philadelphia Ave. streets on either side the bridge will be unaffected.
Neighborhood Greenways

With a reduction of traffic volume and speed, Willamette Blvd. west of Richmond St. can become a neighborhood greenway with standard pavement markings and signage. The Princeton St. and Syracuse St. spurs provide access to downtown St. Johns while avoiding as much hill climb as possible.

Options

Permanent diverters may be concrete islands, removable bollards, mechanized posts that can retreat into the pavement when needed, or even simply one-way signs redirecting traffic away from the intersections. Engaging with emergency services around the needs of their vehicles will play an important role in developing the best treatment.

We recommend beginning the implementation process with temporary installations in order to measure the actual impacts, and to gauge the attitudes of community members once they’ve had a chance to become familiar with the changes.

Secondary Steps

The Syracuse diverters may be more effective at reducing traffic volumes than speeds. The speed limit should be lowered to 20 mph on Willamette Blvd. and speed humps should be added if more calming is needed. If speeds still need to come down, installing a radar speed sign at a key location, such as Richmond Ave., is an effective way to lower speeds. However, it may need to be moved periodically as drivers can become inured to its presence over time.
PREVIOUS TRAFFIC CALMING DESIGN:
NORTH PDX CONNECTED
DIVERTERS

North PDX Connected, another recent PSU Masters in Urban and Regional Planning project, studied the active transportation needs of the peninsula as well. They also considered ways to lower traffic volume and speed on Willamette Blvd. Like us, they recommend the use of traffic diverters near the bridge. The goal was similar to ours, to redirect bridge traffic away from local streets and the design was vetted by PBOT traffic engineers.

The Cathedral Mobility diversion strategy differs in that it addresses the cause of the traffic problems closer to their source, making it less likely that drivers will evade the traffic controls and keep using local streets. However, it is important to acknowledge the viability of this recommendation and PBOT’s existing familiarity with it. It may be that this diversion strategy provides less control but will be supported more by the community.
RECOMMENDATION 1, ALTERNATIVE 1:
TWO-WAY CYCLE TRACK

If implementing the first recommendation is ultimately too disruptive to the community, the preferred alternative is a treatment called for in the Bicycle Plan for 2030: a two-way cycle track. This would likely require the elimination of one parking lane on Willamette Blvd. between Reno St. and Richmond Ave. Without a reduction of traffic volume and speed, this treatment is required to create a safe and comfortable route for bicycle riders. The Princeton St. and Syracuse St. neighborhood greenways remain from the primary recommendation.

Alternative 1

It may be that residents will resist any reduction of parking. The first scenario was designed to preserve essentially all existing parking. However, community members have expressed a need for better bicycle facilities. Willamette Blvd. is narrow enough that some kind of accommodation is required to share the street with active users in a safe and comfortable way.

Trade-Offs

In basic terms, this alternative trades parking for traffic volume and speed. The City may have to research whether residents prefer parking or neighborhood bridge access.

This alternative creates high-quality bike facilities, but we prefer the first option because it better addresses the “busy street” issues. Also, the benefits to pedestrians with this alternative are pushed to the new crossings recommended on page 37, and it is more expensive.
**RECOMMENDATION 1, ALTERNATIVE 2:**

**EDISON ST. NEIGHBORHOOD GREENWAY**

If the community strongly resists treatments that affect bridge traffic and parking, we recommend developing neighborhood greenways on streets besides Willamette Blvd. instead. This is a particularly low-cost alternative as the streets in question are essentially ready for striping and signage.

This alternative features a neighborhood greenway on Edison St., with the Princeton St. and Syracuse St. spurs as well. Edison St. is the only street besides Willamette Blvd. to reach far into the eastern and western halves of the neighborhood in a continuous route. Traffic volume and speed are low and likely no traffic calming is needed.

**Trade-Offs**

Edison St. serves fewer residents, as most people in the neighborhood live north of Willamette Blvd. Edison St. also has a distinctly steeper dip near Burlington St. than Willamette Blvd., affecting riders traveling through the neighborhood and those looking to connect to downtown St. Johns via streets like Burlington St. and Richmond Ave.

However, despite its limitations, this route provides a valuable bicycle and pedestrian route through the neighborhood which we believe will be easy for the community to support. It will be especially useful once the MU-UC redevelops.
RECOMMENDATION 2: ELECTRIC BIKE SHARE

We recommend that public bike share be added to the center of the peninsula around downtown St. Johns, and that this service include electric bicycles.

Bike Share Evaluation

The City is preparing to re-evaluate its bike share program. In particular, they will consider adding service to new areas. The peninsula is a good candidate for inclusion as residents there have an interest in both riding and shareable options.

It is expected that electric bicycles will soon be added to the fleet. This is an important addition to the network of shared vehicles and the downtown St. Johns business district is a good candidate for a dedicated fleet of these as an additional means to help address difficulties with the steep hill.

Bike Share Hubs

Downtown St. Johns is a prime location for a significant number of sharable bicycles as it is the population, commerce, and cultural center of the peninsula.

In addition, there should be at least a small hub near the bottom of the hill near the river, with a dedicated supply of electric bikes. It is important that improved access both up and down the hill is available for residents and employees.

Bike Parking

We also suggest adding bike parking near the park, perhaps a corral, to make these bikes a key option for accessing the park without contradicting City ordinances regarding parking shared vehicles within parks.

This bike parking may coincide with the location of the electric bike hub at the bottom of the hill, but this is not necessary. The electric bike hub should probably be in a location more central to the residents likely to use it. Crawford St. at Richmond Ave. is one potential spot.

It is important to note that the demand at the bottom of the hill may not be large enough yet to justify a hub at Crawford St. and Richmond Ave. If this is the case, we suggest placing the hub adjacent to the park, making the connection between it and downtown St. Johns clear. When the MU-UC is redeveloped, an additional hub can be included as part of the permitting process.
Burlington St. near the river, looking northeast
One of residents’ top priorities is safer and more comfortable places to walk. Engagement activities helped provide a picture of the most important of these needs. The recommendations listed here are not comprehensive, but instead represent the best next steps needed to make the neighborhood accessible for all residents.

**Pedestrian Improvements**

The neighborhood has unpaved streets, sidewalks in disrepair or missing altogether, uncomfortable and unsafe crossings, and slopes that are challenging for most people, but especially those using mobility devices.

We asked people to tell us about the spots most in need of sidewalks and they highlighted locations on Princeton St. and Baltimore Ave. Princeton St. needs sidewalks on both sides of the street. On Baltimore Ave., a sidewalk is needed on the west side as residents strongly prefer to not have to cross the street to continue using a sidewalk. Baltimore Ave. is especially steep, making it difficult for cars cresting the hill to see pedestrians crossing the street.

There is currently a Local Improvement District being developed that involves several central neighborhood streets. However, it is unclear whether the portion that affects John St. will be funded, so we have made our own recommendation to use it as a pedestrian-only connection. A switchback from Edison St. to Princeton St. will provide the only ADA route up the hill.
Another pedestrian need expressed by community members is better crossings. The most important locations for this include Willamette Blvd. at Burlington St. and Richmond Ave., and multiple locations on Ivanhoe St. The Willamette Blvd./Burlington St. intersection is being addressed in the Edison St. LID.

Crosswalks
Crosswalks were requested repeatedly throughout this project. They are visible and readily give the appearance of increased safety. However, City and State guidelines suggest that for these streets, marked crossings may actually increase collisions as pedestrians act with too much confidence.

Willamette Blvd. and Richmond Ave.
One of the main issues with crossing Richmond Ave. at Willamette Blvd. is the length of the crossing---45 ft. While marked crosswalks are inappropriate here, we can extend curbs out into the right-of-way to significantly shorten the crossing distance. The design goal is a maximum of 20 ft. crossings, but allowances have been made for TriMet busses and freight trucks. ADA attributes have been included for each curb ramp. Lastly, we recommend this intersection become an all-way stop to slow traffic on Richmond Ave. and make vehicle and crossing behavior more predictable.
PEDESTRIAN NEEDS: IVANHOE EAST

A central focus of this project was to explore ways to make Ivanhoe St. safer and more comfortable to cross. It stands as the official boundary between the Cathedral Park and St. Johns neighborhoods and acts as a functional barrier between the residential area of Cathedral Park and the downtown St. Johns business district. Residents said John St. and its connection to Safeway was the preferred location for a marked crossing. However, we discovered that Ivanhoe’s highway status was the biggest barrier to making this street safer and more comfortable to cross.

Highway 30 Reroute

We recommend CPNA work with PBOT, ODOT, and Metro to move the freight and highway designation from Ivanhoe St. and Lombard St. to Columbia Blvd.

An analysis of ODOT crash data showed that the section of Ivanhoe St. between Richmond Ave. and Philadelphia Ave. conforms to ODOT’s street design guide for safety, meaning ODOT is unlikely to improve crossings further.

However, if this part of Ivanhoe was under PBOT’s jurisdiction, it would likely qualify for marked crossings under PBOT guidelines. PBOT has considered a jurisdictional transfer like this for some time, but it is a long and complicated endeavor. CPNA can be an effective advocate by working with Metro, who disperses federal transportation dollars. CPNA can advocate for projects that help promote Columbia Blvd. becoming highway 30. Please refer to Chapter 6 for further details.
Ivanhoe St. at Alta Ave.

PEDESTRIAN NEEDS: IVANHOE WEST

We recommend using curb extensions to shorten crossing distances along Ivanhoe St. between St. Louis Ave. and Philadelphia Ave. There are several intersections on Ivanhoe St. west of the bridge that community members and stakeholders have identified as needing better crossings.

Residents again envisioned marked crosswalks, but while the eastern section of Ivanhoe St. meets PBOT standards for marked crosswalks, the western section does not. The primary issue is that the crosswalks are too close to other marked crosswalks at Baltimore St. and Philadelphia Ave.

These curb extensions maintain curb to curb distances of at least 24, based on the City’s lane width standards for regional truck routes.

In addition, PBOT should explore lengthening the crossing times at Baltimore Ave. and Philadelphia Ave. to account for the needs of the older residents in the area (Schrunk Tower).
ISSUE 5: TRANSIT SERVICE

RECOMMENDATION:
LINE 16 EXPRESS

One comment heard as much as any other throughout the project was a call for better bus service to the rest of the city beyond the peninsula.

We considered recommending that TriMet loop Line 44 through the MU-UC to provide residents there direct access to transit. However, TriMet made it clear that any change in service is unlikely until a certain level of demand has developed. This is unlikely to occur until the area has been fully redeveloped. One of the goals of the circulator shuttle mentioned earlier is to bridge the gap between now and when this can become a reality.

Bus Line 16

Line 16 was recently made more frequent, but residents remain unsatisfied. We heard that busses serving Line 16 are over capacity for both bicycles and mobility devices. Forced to wait for another bus, travel times become long enough that it becomes difficult to justify leaving personal vehicles at home for some people.

This delay can be compounded when buses cross the river only to get stuck behind a freight train in the NW industrial area. At the same time, this is the only bus that serves employees in the area and rerouting the 16 around this area would be inappropriate.

We recommend TriMet create an express line that serves the same route but avoids areas that cause delays. This would be in addition to the existing Line 16 so that service will not be disrupted for people who rely on the service.

When not delayed by trains, the route is significantly faster (30 minutes) than other routes like Lines 75 and 44 (45-60 minutes) at peak times getting from the peninsula to downtown. Ridership for Line 16 is relatively low, despite the majority of Cathedral Park residents expressing an interest in using transit. A consistent route to the center of the city with enough space for bikes and mobility devices may encourage an increase in ridership.
CHAPTER 6
Implementation & Funding

Cathedral Mobility has identified ways in which the Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association can further the implementation of these recommendations by coordinating with PBOT and advocating for actions, funding, or both.

Making Ivanhoe St. Safer

According to our research, Ivanhoe street is compliant with ODOT’s safety design standards, which means ODOT has no reason to invest in additional safety improvements, including marked crosswalks. What can be done to make it feel easier and safer to cross the street?

Move Highway 30 from Lombard to Columbia Blvd.

This proposal has been discussed in the city for many years, because Columbia Blvd. would be a much more appropriate street for large trucks to use than Lombard St. and Ivanhoe St. This is especially true in the Cathedral Park neighborhood where it narrows to a two lane road in a small urban town center. However, Columbia Blvd. is not ready to be designated a state highway or primary freight corridor due to several infrastructure deficiencies, such as weight-restricted and low-clearance bridges. These need to be addressed before the designation can be changed.

CPNA needs to have their voice at the table when Metro is selecting which freight and highway projects should be funded. They should work with PBOT to advocate to Metro for freight and highway projects that facilitate Highway 30 being moved to Columbia Blvd. This is the earliest part of the process in which CPNA could make a difference.

Metro recently sent out a call for project applications for their 2022-2024 Regional Flexible Funds for transportation, which is allocating $9.91 million for freight and economic development projects. Public comment for this process begins in September 2019.

You can find more information about this program at https://www.oregonmetro.gov/tools-partners/grants-and-resources/regional-flexible-funding.

Metro Contact: Ted Leybold, Transportation Planning Manager, ted.leybold@oregonmetro.gov
**Education, Enforcement, and Advocacy**

In the interim, there are steps outside of large, complex bureaucratic processes that have the potential to improve the feel and the safety of Ivanhoe St.

**Education**

- Work with PBOT and Safe Routes to School to educate kids on proper pedestrian etiquette when it comes to crossing busy streets.
- Work with high school students to teach defensive driving habits and how to yield to vulnerable road users.

**Enforcement**

- Work with the Portland Police Bureau Traffic Unit to eliminate speeding and failures to yield to pedestrians.
- Install radar speed signs to make drivers aware of how fast they are going.

**Advocacy**

Governments tend to operate on a complaint-based system, so be proactive and persistent in identifying deferred maintenance items. Here are a few sample questions to keep in mind:

- Are the trees pruned back?
- Are the signs as visible as they need to be?
- Are there potholes, cracks, or faded striping?

Go here to let the City know: [https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/564769](https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/564769)

**LIDs**

An LID is a mechanism by which property owners can share in the cost of infrastructure improvements. In these agreements, the City makes the necessary improvements and the affected property owners pay the City back over a certain number of years.

Infrastructure improvements can be very expensive, and there are not enough funds for every need. There are a large number of unpaved streets in Cathedral Park that would benefit from paving, sidewalk installation, and stormwater management. LIDs are one way to generate funds for needed improvements.

CPNA should continue the groundwork we started with the Burlington St./Edison St. LID. We worked with PBOT to estimate the relative costs of improving the streets in the LID. It would be beneficial for CPNA to coordinate with PBOT to conduct interviews with property owners within the LID to determine their willingness to develop. There are several reasons why CPNA should lead this effort:

- PBOT may not have the capacity to do this in a timely fashion.
- Residents may trust their neighborhood association more than the City government. As a liason, CPNA could help to build a bridge between residents and the City that makes for a smoother and faster implementation process.

CPNA should also work with PBOT to explore the establishment of LIDs for recommendation areas like Princeton St. and Crawford St. These infrastructure needs are similar to those in the Edison St. LID. CPNA may end up conducting similar interviews in these areas as well.
Safe Routes to School

When streets are perceived to not be safe enough to for children to walk, bike, or use a mobility device to go to school, more children are driven to school which increases congestion. There are no elementary, middle, or high schools in Cathedral Park, but there are a number of streets in the neighborhood children use to get to schools nearby in St. Johns.

The two main types of funding for Safe Routes to School are:

- Infrastructure programs, which focus on ensuring that safe routes are in place for students by securing investments in crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes and other multimodal infrastructure.
- Non-infrastructure programs, which focus on providing education and outreach on how to safely use existing routes.

The ODOT Safe Routes to School Competitive Infrastructure Grant Program runs in two year cycles. Cities, counties, school districts and other public entities are all encouraged to apply. Projects must be within the public right of way, be within one mile of a school, have at least 40% local cash match (or 20% if appropriate criteria are met), and request a minimum of $60,000 and maximum of $2 million in funds.

More information, as well as links to other Safe Routes to School websites, can be found at https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Programs/Pages/SRTS.aspx

Metro Central Improvement Grants

The Metro Central Improvement Grants support residents within the vicinity of Forest Park and a small region of the Cathedral Park neighborhood centered around the St. Johns Bridge.

These grants are designed to serve communities which have been negatively affected by a nearby waste transfer station. Grant proposals must be for projects which strive to promote equity within their communities, and which support one or more of the following goals:

- Improve the safety, appearance or cleanliness of neighborhoods.
- Improve the environmental quality of the area.
- Preserve or enhance wildlife areas within the target area.
- Improve or increase recreation opportunities for residents in the target area.
- Provide training or services that benefit youth, elderly and/or low-income residents.
- Increase recycling opportunities for residents of the area.

_Cathedral Mobility_ recommendations qualify for these grants because they improve neighborhood safety, increase recreation opportunities and provide services which benefit low income and elderly residents.
RowanWood Planning is a Master of Urban and Regional Planning (MURP) workshop team at Portland State University. They are committed to promoting the wellbeing of all residents through safe and healthy transportation, balancing the needs of all users, modes, and impacted communities.

Chad Tucker
Chad Tucker got his B.A. in Community Development from Portland State University in 2014 and plans to graduate with his Masters in Urban and Regional Planning in June 2019. He is passionate about improving the overall transportation network, particularly when it comes to passenger trains, buses, and freight transportation. He has a lovely wife and two young kids. When he isn’t musing about how to improve freight access without also encouraging more auto access, he plays board games, reads sci-fi, goes on outings with the family, and bakes biscuits from scratch.

Ian Clancy
Ian’s interests lie primarily in active transportation, GIS, and public trails. His career goals involve promoting plans and policies that encourage walking and biking and the use of transit to reduce reliance on automobiles. He graduated from the University of Oregon’s Planning, Public Policy and Management program and completed a Graduate Certificate in Transportation from Portland State University before pursuing his Master’s in Urban and Regional Planning.

Erik Memmott
Erik has a background in active transportation planning. He thinks it is critical that that we protect and promote other ways of travel than personal vehicles if we are ever going to overcome the burdens of the Highway Age. He completed his Bachelor’s degree in Geography from Portland State University, with a focus on Human Geography and the study of place. His daily work combines the analyses of human behavior and spatial patterns in order to build and promote a brighter future.
APPENDIX A

Public Involvement

Community engagement is the central focus of Cathedral Mobility. It is the key validation for the recommendations within. It was RowanWood Planning’s mission to deliver to Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association recommendations that PBOT could use that truly reflect the community’s experiences and desires.

It is because of this reliance on community feedback that we have recorded here the questions that were asked, why they were asked, how they connect to subsequent actions, and how they ultimately resulted in these recommendations. This information will make it easier to expand on this research and implement positive changes.
Role of the Community in Cathedral Mobility

The Cathedral Mobility project was created to help address active transportation needs of the Cathedral Park community, including overlapping issues concerning the steep hill and busy streets in the neighborhood. There are profound needs in the area and this plan is an important tool to help address them.

This project is intended to showcase these needs and trigger a response from the City. Cathedral Park Neighborhood is small and perhaps a little out of the way from some perspectives, so this report intends to shine a spotlight on a small area of a City full of diverse and sometimes competing needs.

PBOT communicated to the RowanWood team that one of the most effective tools at our disposal is community feedback. It is important to them to get an idea of what the community supports and what it does not. Understanding the strength of this support, in either direction, is useful when they prioritize projects.

Purpose of Engagement

Cathedral Mobility recommendations are balanced with expert opinion and technical analysis, but their design is a direct result of community feedback.

At the start of the project, CPNA provided us with a few issues and topics we were most likely to hear about. We used this information to draft our initial survey about attitudes and experiences. Although CPNA gave us a head start, it was imperative that we avoid making assumptions, so we designed the survey to have an open format with plenty of opportunity for residents to record their thoughts free-form. In this manner we felt secure that we were not leading residents with questions designed to fulfill our own expectations. The project continuously evolved following the track of feedback received from community members.
Goals

Co-Creation

Cathedral Mobility was designed to partner with the community to find the right solutions to the most important problems. This was intended to build capacity within the community by the sharing of knowledge and experiences. Cathedral Park residents are passionate about their neighborhood, and many of those who participated in outreach activities expressed gratitude for the project and the ability to help with it. Some of those who participated are members of community groups that are typically overlooked in planning processes.

Validity

It is critical that the community strongly support these recommendations for this document to have any standing with the City. Community members helped to draft our initial questions, and a large contingent of them ended up answering them. Community members helped us use this information to design an open house and draft the second survey. Residents gave feedback on recommendations at multiple stages.

This document showcases an understanding of the needs and desires of community members and recommendations that they support. Some of the issues are complicated, and conflicting interests make it difficult to make one concrete recommendation at times, but the document as whole is a powerful tool to help bring about important changes.
Cathedral Mobility worked under a condensed time frame of only six months. This meant that it was important to begin talking with residents as quickly as possible. It also meant that engagement stages often overlapped. There were stages that had to move forward with incomplete information. However, review of information after the fact suggests that few things, if any, would have been done differently given more time.

We expected to have varying levels of response to engagement activities, so we designed events and surveys to overlap somewhat in content and questions asked. This helped ensure that different groups of people engaged with each topic. This meant that a blend of different events and slightly different questions was used to interpret community views and interests. However, the overarching themes of community feedback have been consistent throughout the project.

Equity

Cathedral Park has a lower proportion of people of color and has a higher median income than the city as a whole. This doesn’t mean that communities of concern are not present, but that we had to take special care to reach groups that have historically been underrepresented.

The neighborhood is small enough that we were able to place survey advertisements on essentially every door. We went this far to help make sure our implicit biases did not allow us to avoid any locations we may not have felt as comfortable with, although we did not visit any location that felt unsafe.

We worked with residents of the Schrunk Riverview Tower, a 55+ low income apartment building operated by Home Forward. The goal was to gain the perspectives of older residents, the experiences and needs of whom we may not have heard about otherwise.

Surveys, advertisements, website information, and exhibits were all translated into Spanish, but none were returned. We made them available and made an effort to put them in the hands of those who could use them, but future community engagement in the area will have to go further to reach this community.

In addition, we recognize that we could have done more to reach the young people of this community. We spoke with the PTA president for James John Elementary, but we were not able to speak directly to younger residents. While we did consider the impacts of our recommendations on children, future engagement will have to fill in this gap.
Events & Activities

First Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting

The first TAC meeting was held at PBOT, very early in the project. The purpose of this was to gain the perspectives of professionals and experts. We discussed existing conditions, opportunities and constraints, and initial thoughts on treatment options. The goal was to make sure the plan was well designed and useful.

First Survey

The short time frame of the project meant that we were out in the field within the first few weeks with our first survey. This was delivered in a number of ways: intercept and doorbell surveys, drop-off surveys left at community gathering spots, and linked on the CPNA website. The electronic version also connected to a web map where people could record specific issues in specific locations. The first survey had a total of 133 responses.

Open House

The first event was an open house held at the Portland Baha’i Center. This location is within the project study area, but also part of the downtown St. Johns business district. It was held on a sunny Saturday in early April. It coincidentally overlapped with a popular native plant sale nearby at the neighborhood square, with whom we shared some cross-advertising. It was expected that the plant sale would help attendance as people would already be downtown and otherwise enjoying the unseasonably nice weather.

The goals of this event were to show the community the responses received from the first survey, ask some of them again, and build upon them. Exhibits and activities were designed to educate, inform, and involve residents.

The first exhibit was a large map featuring comments from first survey’s web map that people could add to. The next was a poster displaying key findings from the first survey. The next exhibit looked to illustrate finer details about residents’ travel experiences and desires by asking them to fill out a map handout with the routes they currently use to walk, roll, and bike in the neighborhood, as well as those routes they would like to use but on which they do not feel comfortable. Participants were then given an opportunity to fill out comment cards with any suggestions they had at that point.

There are several changes coming to the transit system not directly related to this project. We provided information about these changes and gave people a chance to comment on them as a way to bring to light any issues we may not have considered yet.

This was still very early in the project and we didn’t want to jump into recommendations without gauging the community’s interest in types of treatments. We designed a multi-level voting activity using photos of potential treatments and different kinds of beans. People could put single votes in up to 6 jars, no more than one per jar, and they were given 3 “favorite” beans they could distribute in any manner they pleased. To finish things off there was place for people to comment about anything else that had not been covered.

Unfortunately, the open house had low turnout, with only 6 attendees. However, we capitalized on the opportunity to speak at length with each person. What was intended to cover broad subjects with large number of people became something closer to full stakeholder interviews with elaborate displays.
Second Survey

The second survey was built upon what we heard in the first survey and at the open house. Several key issues had appeared: the hill, bike needs, pedestrian needs, crossing needs, and transit needs. We collated the various pieces relating to specific locations and pared them down to a few options for each subject. Based on the open house voting activity, industry best practices, and expert opinions, we selected several treatments for each issue. These were categorized by either cost or how they impact users. This made it easier for residents who do not fully understand the differences between options like chicane and speed table to make informed decisions.

Questions were designed for people to choose categories of treatments for specific locations. This survey was only online, as it was significantly longer than the first and had a number of maps, photos, and images displaying treatment options that made printing prohibitive. Fewer people took this survey, 33 in total, but the feedback we received was valuable in the creation of draft recommendations.

Second TAC Meeting

We created packets similar to those used at Schrunk Tower to showcase our draft recommendations and provided space for comments. We had a vibrant discussion with the committee about our proposals, including several options we were considering but hadn’t decided upon. Their input was instrumental in taking our recommendations from the draft stage to what we presented at the Plan Refinement Workshop. The committee vetted some of our ideas and pointed us in several new directions.
**Schrunk Tower Workshop**

We created a workshop to discuss project draft recommendations with residents who live at Schrunk Riverview Tower, a 55+ low income apartment complex. This community lives in the heart of the neighborhood, close to the downtown business district, is within walking distance to waterfront park, and is adjacent to several of the corridors we studied. The goal was to hear from residents that often get overlooked, yet may be impacted by our recommendations more than most. The event was designed to break into small groups of four or five with a RowanWood facilitator for each group. We created packets with information about our recommendations with space to make notes.

This event also had low turnout. Only a few residents participated, and those that did came at different times, making it difficult to form discussion groups. We took the opportunity to work with people individually or in pairs and were able to go into more depth than we may have otherwise. Some participants chose to look through the packets on their own and make written comments. This event gave us an opportunity to test our recommendations and also highlighted some issues that we hadn’t previously considered, such as the prevalence of poor and missing curb ramps, and the inconvenience of a missing stretch of sidewalk on Baltimore St.

**CPNA Monthly General Meeting Plan Refinement Workshop**

This was a pivotal engagement event. We invited all community members to join us for a plan refinement workshop as part of CPNA’s monthly general meeting. About 20 people participated, and we were able to break out into small discussion groups of about 6 each. Residents were largely enthusiastic about our recommendations. However, this was also the first time we received significant pushback.

We anticipated that people would resist changes to on-street parking and bridge access, but this was the first opportunity we had to discuss them with community members directly. We explained our proposals and had a lively discussion about their impacts. We took note of their thoughts and answered their questions. The goal was not to reach consensus that day, but rather to help us understand what people supported, what they did not, and why.

We learned a lot from this event, and we did our best to incorporate the concerns we heard into our recommendations. This workshop made it clear that there are conflicting and competing interests in the community, and it may be difficult to find solutions that please everybody. For issues that are particularly complex, we not only adapted our recommendations but also created alternatives. The best functional solution may not be politically viable and, in these cases, we prioritized multiple alternatives to help future planners find the right balance for this community.
Themes

Pedestrians

In Cathedral Park, people walk, and because they do, the limitations of the pedestrian infrastructure are all the more apparent. People want crossing improvements, even more than we were able to include. They want sidewalk gaps filled in. We expected gaps that only affect one side of the street to not be a major priority, but the community said otherwise.

Ivanhoe was not mentioned as much as we expected, but interviews suggest that this may have more to do with people avoiding it than there not being issues with it.

Bicycles Riders

Many people commented that bike lanes, in a variety of forms, would go a long way to get them out on two wheels. Several people asked for the North Portland Greenway Trail to be completed.

Community members reacted poorly to electric bikeshare in the open house voting exercise, but responded more strongly when it was tied to other bike improvements discussed at the CPNA workshop.

Residents made it clear that although bicycle ridership in the neighborhood is relatively low, the interest in it is high. They conveyed the impression of a group of people just waiting for the right conditions to become an active transportation hub.

Transit

Community members let us know that while in some ways the neighborhood is well served by transit, in other critical ways, it is not. We expected to hear more about bus stop locations, but what we heard was that service to downtown has serious issues, especially during peak times. Buses do not have enough capacity for bicycles and mobility devices and Line 16 has a propensity for getting delayed behind freight trains in the NW industrial area. These inconveniences make it difficult for people to leave their car at home.

Many people avoid riding the bus due to costs, infrequency, inconsistency, the length of trips, numerous transfers, personal safety, inconvenience, and the need to assist children.

Bus stop locations were not as big of a concern as we expected, but we still designed recommendations to connect with existing stops.
Busy Streets

Many people commented that car behavior, especially speeding, is a significant barrier to walking and biking. Busy streets are a major issue, in particular Ivanhoe St., Willamette Blvd., and Richmond Ave.

Busy streets were not initially a major target for our evaluation, but community members quickly made it clear that this was a pressing issue.

We were not able to complete a full traffic analysis of the neighborhood, and so recommendations are constrained to issues on key neighborhood streets, as well as better ways to cross Ivanhoe St.

The Hill

The steep hill did not appear to be as big of a concern in the first survey as we had expected, but still, over a third of residents saw it as a barrier. We heard more about it later in the project.

The residents we spoke to who use mobility devices were largely ambivalent about the hill issues we asked them about. However, most of them seem to reside at or near the top of the hill.

General

Safety was one of the most common issues we heard about, in a variety of contexts. It became a central focus of this project and it plays an important role in most of our recommendations.

Pollution was a concern expressed by a few people across several questions and events.

Willamette Blvd. was not originally a main target for recommendations, but community members made it clear that this is a critical street that is a nexus for several community concerns.

Interestingly, we mistakenly included Princeton St. west of the bridge as an option for one survey question, but this road does not exist, and yet, a number of people voted for it.

Outside of the Schrunk Tower workshop, we managed to contact more people who use mobility devices than we expected. We did not count how many, but anecdotally, it seemed a significant amount.
Survey Results

Survey 1

The first survey was designed to find out what how people in Cathedral Park are experiencing the neighborhood and how they would like to experience it, as related to walking, rolling, biking, and using transit.

The majority of people walk regularly and 31% report riding a bicycle regularly. This is much higher than recorded commute trip levels (5%), so these numbers may represent aspirations more than reality. Regular here is defined as one or more times a week.

Percentage of residents who use modes other than cars regularly:

- How many times a week do you walk or roll (wheelchair, mobility device) to get around the area?
  - Never 9%
  - Occasionally 15%
  - 1-4 34%
  - 5+ 43%

- How many times a week do you ride a bicycle to get around the area?
  - Never 14%
  - 1-4 17%
  - Occasionally 27%

- How many times a week do you take the bus to get to work or other places?
  - Never 9%
  - 1-4 10%
  - Occasionally 39%
It was important that we hear from community members what they view as barriers in the active transportation system. It was good that we asked this, as we had some unexpected results. Busy streets was the largest barrier, which was a last-minute addition to the question list. We also expected the steep hill and transit service to be bigger problems than reported. We did hear more about these issues at other times, though.

Proportion of residents who thought of each issue as a barrier to getting around the area without a car:

- Busy roads: 46% Big Barrier, 38% Small Barrier, 17% Not a barrier
- Poor or missing sidewalks: 20% Big Barrier, 57% Small Barrier, 23% Not a barrier
- Poor or missing crosswalks: 32% Big Barrier, 44% Small Barrier, 24% Not a barrier
- Poor or missing bikeways: 43% Big Barrier, 28% Small Barrier, 29% Not a barrier
- Poor or unpaved roads: 22% Big Barrier, 46% Small Barrier, 33% Not a barrier
- Infrequent bus service: 32% Big Barrier, 33% Small Barrier, 35% Not a barrier
- Steep hills: 18% Big Barrier, 72% Small Barrier, 10% Not a barrier
- Bus stops that are too far away: 18% Big Barrier, 57% Small Barrier, 26% Not a barrier
We people what is keeping them from walking, rolling, biking, or using transit, which overlaps somewhat with the previous question about what people perceive as barriers, but the open ended question allowed people to provide information about specific issues in specific locations as well as information we had not thought to ask. We also asked people what they thought would change their behavior, because a removal of a hinderance is not always enough to change behavior.

There are a significant number of responses that didn’t fall naturally into any useful category. These comments are either not shared, not helpful, or unrelated to the project.

### What is keeping people from walking, rolling (wheelchair, mobility device), biking, or taking the bus?

**Why don't you walk or roll (wheelchair, mobility device) to get around the area?**

- 40% Other
- 25% Poor/Unsafe Conditions
- 35% Convenience

### What may get people to walk, roll (wheelchair, mobility device), bike, or take the bus more?

**What would make you consider walking more?**

- 45% Other
- 32% Sidewalk Improvements
- 14% Crosswalk Improvements
- 9% Finish N. Portland Greenway Trail

**What would make you consider biking more?**

- 45% Other
- 35% Better Bike Facilities
- 10% Other
- 10% Different Weather
- 10% Traffic Calming

**What would make you consider taking the bus more?**

- 40% Other
- 25% Better Routes and Connections
- 25% Greater Frequency
- 25% Lower Costs

### Why don't you take the bus to get to work or other places?

- 69% Work Close to Home
- 22% Other
- 9% Convenience
Survey 2

The first survey, the open house, stakeholder interviews, and the first TAC meeting all informed the lists of locations provided in the second survey. We used this information to pare the list of possible locations to those that appeared to be the most important to the community. The goal of the second survey was to give residents options to choose from that represented all of the most likely locations and treatments to be effective at creating the changes called for in the first survey. That way, they could make informed decisions without having too many options that made questions difficult to answer. Treatments were categorized by either cost or how they impacted users. This made it easier for residents who don’t fully understand the differences between options like chicanes and speed tables to make informed decisions.

Pick the most important locations for crossing improvements
Choose up to 3

Which is the most important location for sidewalk improvements?
N = 32

What are the best improvements for each street to help people get up the hill?
Choose up to 3

Responses, N = 86
### What are the most important places from the map above for bike improvements? What are the most appropriate improvements?

Please choose up to 3 locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Responses, N = 85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willamette east of the bridge Minor Investments</td>
<td>13% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette east of the bridge Major Investments</td>
<td>13% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette west of the bridge Minor Investments</td>
<td>8% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton east of the bridge Minor Investments</td>
<td>8% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton east of the bridge Major Investments</td>
<td>7% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Minor Investments</td>
<td>6% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette west of the bridge Moderate Investments</td>
<td>6% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette west of the bridge Major Investments</td>
<td>6% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton east of the bridge Moderate Investments</td>
<td>6% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton east of the bridge Minor Investments</td>
<td>6% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton west of the bridge Moderate Investments</td>
<td>4% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford Moderate Investments</td>
<td>4% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Moderate Investments</td>
<td>2% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton east of the bridge Major Investments</td>
<td>2% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford Minor Investments</td>
<td>2% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Minor Investments</td>
<td>1% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Moderate Investments</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton east of the bridge Moderate Investments</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton west of the bridge Major Investments</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton west of the bridge Minor Investments</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What are the most important places to slow down traffic and the most appropriate ways to accomplish this?

Please choose up to 2 locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Responses, N = 61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willamette east of bridge Improvements you have to drive over</td>
<td>11% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette east of bridge Improvements you have to drive under</td>
<td>11% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Improvements you have to drive over</td>
<td>8% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Improvements you have to drive over</td>
<td>8% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette west of the bridge Improvements you have to drive over</td>
<td>7% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette west of the bridge Improvements you have to drive under</td>
<td>7% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe west of bridge Improvements you have to drive over</td>
<td>5% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Improvements you have to drive around</td>
<td>5% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Visual Cues</td>
<td>5% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe east of bridge Improvements you have to drive over</td>
<td>5% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe east of bridge Improvements you have to drive under</td>
<td>5% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Improvements you have to drive over</td>
<td>3% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton Improvements you have to drive over</td>
<td>3% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette east of bridge Visual Cues</td>
<td>3% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton east of bridge Visual Cues</td>
<td>3% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe east of bridge Visual Cues</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Visual Cues</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Improvements you have to drive over</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette west of the bridge Visual Cues</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe west of bridge Visual Cues</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Visual Cues</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Improvements you have to drive around</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton Visual Cues</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton Improvements you have to drive around</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The open house had low turnout, 5 or 6 people, so the results of this voting exercise should not be considered representative of the neighborhood as a whole.
Open House Hand-Out Map Exercise Results

Participants were asked to show where they feel comfortable walking and biking in the neighborhood, and where they would like to but don’t feel comfortable enough to do so. Only two people completed this exercise, so they are shown here in their entirety. It is remarkable how differently they feel about certain routes, how different their “territories” are, and how important certain routes are regardless of comfort level.
Map Exercise Results

Pictured below are the results from the map exercise from the first survey and the map displayed at the Plan Refinement Workshop that shows the map comments from the first survey and the open house combined.

First Survey Web Map Exercise

Combined Map Comments
Hello, Again!
Thank you to everyone who filled out the first Cathedral Mobility Survey a few weeks ago. We’d like to invite you to take one more five-minute survey that builds on what we have heard so far by asking you what the right improvements are and the most important places to put them. Your feedback will directly impact our recommendations which will be presented to local public agencies on behalf of the Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association.
You can find information about our project, results from the first survey, and how to take this survey at www.cathedralparkpdx.org.

Or, go directly to the survey: www.cathedralparkpdx.org

Questions?
Contact:
Cathedral Mobility Communications
Email: cpnmobility@gmail.com

¡Hola otra ves!
Gracias a todos los que completaron la primera Encuesta de Movilidad de Catedral hace unas semanas.

O, puede ir directamente la encuesta en:
www.cathedralparkpdx.org

¿Preguntas?
Contacto: Cathedral Mobility Comunicaciones
Correo Electrónicos: cpnmobility@gmail.com

¡Muchas gracias!
Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association (CPNA) and Portland State planning students, in collaboration with the Portland Bureau of Transportation, are looking for the best ways to improve walking, biking, transit and ADA access in the neighborhood. We’d like your help by answering a few questions below.

You can also take it online at cathedralparkpdx.org.

1. **How many times a week do you:**
   - Ride a bicycle to get around the area? [ ] 5+ [ ] 1-5 [ ] Occasionally [ ] Never [ ] Does Not Apply
   - Walk or roll (mobility device) to get around the area? [ ] 5+ [ ] 1-5 [ ] Occasionally [ ] Never [ ] Does Not Apply
   - Take the bus to get to work or other places? [ ] 5+ [ ] 1-5 [ ] Occasionally [ ] Never [ ] Does Not Apply

2. **If you don’t ride a bicycle to get around the area, why not?**

3. **If you don’t walk or roll (mobility device) to get around the area, why not?**

4. **If you don’t take the bus to get around the area, why not?**
5. How much have these issues been a barrier for you when walking, rolling (wheelchair), riding a bike, or taking the bus in the area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Not a barrier</th>
<th>Minor barrier</th>
<th>Major barrier</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor or missing sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor or missing bikeways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor or missing crosswalks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses don't come often enough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus stops too far away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steep hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor or unpaved roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busy streets (speed/volume)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What would make you consider riding a bike more?

7. What would make you consider walking or rolling (mobility device) more?

8. What would make you consider taking the bus more?

9. Please share an intersection near your home (optional).

Contact Information
If you would like to know about future developments and events, please leave your information here.

Name

Email
Survey 2: Locations & Treatments

Cathedral Mobility Improvements Survey

We got great information from community members who filled out our first survey about their transportation experiences and preferences! We are using this information to build towards walking, rolling (wheelchair, mobility device), biking, and transit improvement recommendations. A sample of the data from the previous survey is below (Figure 1). You can see the results in their entirety at cathedralparkpdx.org

Figure 1. Sample data from earlier survey (more at cathedralparkpdx.org)
Sidewalk Improvements

Community members reported several locations where they felt that poor or missing sidewalks created problems for them getting around the neighborhood. The locations below are those mentioned by several people each.

1. Which is the most important location for improvements?
   1. Baltimore   ○
   2. Princeton   ○
   3. Edison      ○
Crossing Improvements

There are several locations that community members have described as difficult and unsafe to cross.

Potential Locations for Crossing Improvements

2. Pick the most important locations from the map above for crossing improvements. Please choose up to 3.

- 1. Ivanhoe at Catlin
- 2. Ivanhoe at St. Louis
- 3. Ivanhoe at Chicago
- 4. Ivanhoe at Leavitt
- 5. Ivanhoe at John
- 6. Ivanhoe at the Safeway Path
- 7. Ivanhoe at Charleston
- 8. Willamette at Philadelphia
- 9. Willamette at Burlington
- 10. Willamette at Richmond
- 11. Willamette at Polk
- 12. Willamette at Buchanan
Steep Hill Improvements

We heard from community members that the hill is a mobility challenge. This could affect a lot more people if the area near the river redevelops soon.

Possible improvements to help with the hill

Major Investment $ $$$
Moderate Investment $ $
Minor Investment $ 

3. What are the best improvements for each street to help people get up the hill?

Major Investment $ $$$
Moderate Investment $ $
Minor Investment $ 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Major Investments - $$ $$ (funicular, switchback, or moving walkway)</th>
<th>Moderate Investments - $$ $(stairs, circulator shuttle)</th>
<th>Minor Investments - $ (electric bike share)</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Burlington</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. John</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Richmond</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Baltimore</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bicycle Improvements

We heard from community members that there is a sincere interest in bike riding, but that neighborhood streets do not make it feel safe or convenient.

Potential Locations for Bicycle Improvements

Potential Bicycle Improvements

Major Investment $ $$$
Moderate Investment $ $$
Minor Investment $ $

Off-Street Bike Path - $$$
Protected Bike Lane - $$$
Buffered Bike Lane - $
Bike Lane - $
Neighborhood Greenway - $
4. What are the most important places from the map above for bike improvements? What are the most appropriate improvements?

Major Investment $$$
Moderate Investment $$
Minor Investment $

Please choose up to 3 locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Major Investments - $$$</th>
<th>Moderate Investments - $$</th>
<th>Minor Investments - $</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Princeton west of the bridge</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton east of the bridge</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette west of the bridge</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette east of the bridge</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Busy Streets Improvements

We heard from community members that these streets are dangerous to cross in spots and uncomfortable to walk, roll (wheelchair, mobility device), and bike along due to the amount and speed of traffic.

*Busy Streets*

Potential Improvements to Slow Down Traffic on Busy Streets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drive over</th>
<th>Drive around</th>
<th>Visual Cues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed Hump</td>
<td>Roundabout</td>
<td>Radar Speed Sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumble Strips</td>
<td>Diverter</td>
<td>Diagonal Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. From the map above, what are the most important places to slow down traffic and the most appropriate ways to accomplish this? Please choose up to 2 locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Improvements you have to drive over (speed hump, rumble strips)</th>
<th>Improvements you have to drive around (roundabout, diverter)</th>
<th>Visual cues (radar speed sign, diagonal parking)</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ivanhoe west of bridge</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ivanhoe east of bridge</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Willamette west of the bridge</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Princeton</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Philadelphia</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Willamette east of bridge</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Burlington</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Richmond</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We like to keep track of who we have reached. The following questions will only be used to make sure we aren’t missing any community groups.

6. Which of the following groups includes your age?

   Under 18
   18-24
   25-44
   45-61
   62 and older
   Decline to state

7. How do you identify your gender?

   Female
   Male
   Non-Binary
   Transgender
   I identify with a different gender
   Decline to state

8. Do you identify as having or living with a disability that impairs mobility?

   Yes
   No
   Decline to state
9. Which group includes your household annual income from all sources?
   - Under $15,000
   - $15,000 to $19,999
   - $20,000 to $39,999
   - $40,000 to $49,999
   - $50,000 to $74,999
   - $75,000 to $99,999
   - Over $100,000
   - Decline to state

10. Which of these groups do you identify with? Check all that apply
    - American Indian or Alaskan Native
    - Asian
    - Black or African American
    - Hispanic or Latino
    - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
    - White
    - Multiple Races
    - Decline to state

Anything Else?

11. What do you feel is the most important issue that has been covered in this survey? Please tell us why you feel that way.

12. Is there an important issue related to walking, rolling (wheelchair, mobility device), riding a bike, and taking the bus that has not been covered here?
Continuing Opportunities

Several other concerns were considered as parts of our project, but were ultimately not included due to either time or staffing constraints. The following are recommendations for further projects and research that will compliment and/or augment that which has been completed in this project.

**Stakeholder Interviews**

During our study of the Local Improvement District near the MU-UC, we were unable to interview property owners, developers and other stakeholders regarding their participation in current or future neighborhood LIDs. We recommend that CPNA work with PBOT to interview neighbors regarding the redevelopment of their property and the potential for roadway improvements.

**Local Business Outreach**

We recommend that CPNA continue outreach with local businesses in support of this Cathedral Mobility. There could very well be significant interest in our proposals that we did not bring to light yet. These may include retail establishments and industrial land owners, as well as the 100+ small businesses located at Cathedral Park Place.

Forming connections and partnerships with international businesses, such as the local taqueria, Tienda Y Taqueria Santa Cruz, can help CPNA develop relationships with community members from historically underrepresented populations that we did not adequately reach.

---

**Neighborhood Plan**

There has not been a new or updated neighborhood plan for the St. Johns/Lombard region since the 2004 St. Johns/Lombard Plan. The Cathedral Park Neighborhood does not have its own neighborhood plan. A neighborhood plan will address many areas that RowanWood would liked to have included, such as land use, community development, economic development, housing and houselessness.

---

**Equity & Gentrification Analyses**

As neighborhoods redevelop and their economies change, historically, low-income residents and communities of color often get pushed out. With development and transportation changes coming to the neighborhood in the near future, it is possible that gentrification and displacement will occur. This project was not able to focus on this issue and future research into prevention and mitigation is strongly recommended.
North Portland Greenway

The North Portland Greenway is a trail project linking North Portland neighborhoods with the Willamette River and downtown. Its path runs directly through the Cathedral Park neighborhood and we initially intended to incorporate elements of its implementation, but time constraints forced it off our agenda.

Part of the challenge surrounding the completion of this section of the Greenway lies with addressing the unpaved portion of Decatur St. located between Baltimore and Trumbull Avenues. The road’s uneven terrain makes it unfit for bicycle travel and it is rarely used by vehicles and freight.

Given that Decatur St. runs parallel to the green space known as Baltimore Woods, the neighborhood group Friends of Baltimore Woods has a vested interest in improving this section of Decatur St. The group recommends several procedures related to this process:

• Improving nearby Bradford St. in order to make it a more attractive route for trucks. This includes addressing turn radius issues at the intersection of Baltimore Ave. and Bradford St.

• Improving Decatur St. without the addition of a retaining wall between the street and the woods (this should not be necessary if the street is not widened). A retaining wall will take away from the experience of walking next to the woods.

• Moving telephone poles mostly utilized by nearby industry down to Bradford St. instead of through the forest which presents a fire hazard.

The group expressed a desire for making the neighborhood a premier location for active transportation; however, they argue that the necessary infrastructure is not yet in place for this to be possible.

Freight Impacts

Research is needed to determine how existing and future freight rail uses will impact future development in the planned waterfront Mixed Use-Urban Center. A current TSP project includes addressing rail switching noise near the Toyota industrial facility, but it is not known whether there will be other significant impacts caused by existing rail installations on future uses.

If no changes to the existing rail line are made, and the planned mixed use development is to co-exist with the rail line, there could be problems with safety issues regarding rail traffic interacting with other transportation modes at grade, as well as the possibility of emergency vehicles being delayed by passing trains.

Land Use Planning

Land use and transportation planning are inexorably linked. Even though we were unable to do so ourselves, we recommend that land use planning be included in conjunction with any transportation-related plan.

Neighborhood Bike/Ped Plan

Although our surveys and other activities targeted the entire Cathedral Park neighborhood, our analysis of transportation network conditions primarily focused on the region located southeast of the St. Johns Bridge. A full-scale analysis of the Cathedral Park neighborhood will be necessary for a complete bicycle and pedestrian plan that designates dedicated bicycle and pedestrian routes throughout the entire neighborhood, making it a safe and friendly walking and biking environment for residents and their families.
Equity

Outreach to underserved and non-English speaking populations proved difficult for this project given available time and resources. We were not able to target these populations outside of translating engagement materials into Spanish. Ensuring all populations in the neighborhood are reached is essential to an equitable planning process. More research regarding effective strategies for targeting underserved populations in the neighborhood is strongly recommended.

Youth Outreach

We interviewed the PTA President of James John Elementary, Mason Marsh, regarding his suggestions for making nearby street conditions safer for children and their families traveling to and from school. However, we were not able to engage with James John Elementary and other area schools as much as we would have liked. This includes engaging with the youth regarding their opinions on traffic conditions and mobility issues in the surrounding neighborhood, particularly in our study area. A more robust engagement process targeting all school populations is recommended.
Steel Hammer site within the MU-UC
Planning Context (extended)

There are many plans that intersect and overlap the project area and its recommendations. As an advocacy tool, it is important that the political and planning landscapes are visible and understood. This is why we have elaborated on the planning context summary included earlier in this document.

Metro Region 2040 Growth Concept (1994)

Metro designated a number of mixed use development areas corresponding with its 10 urban design components identified in the 2040 Growth Concept Map.

Our study area is a part of the St. Johns region which is designated as a Town Center (or large neighborhood center), which provides housing and employment as well as access to goods and services to thousands of people within a 2- to 3-mile radius. Town Centers are walkable, bikeable areas with mixed residential and commercial uses and which provide easy access to public transit.

Similarly, the St. Johns neighborhood features a number of Main Streets which are walkable areas with frequent transit service and a “strong sense of the immediate neighborhood”. They provide neighborhood shopping as well as commercial and office uses, and may also provide residential installments.

The Cathedral Park neighborhood is home to Industrial Areas and Freight Terminals which include industrial and freight facilities for truck, marine and rail cargo sites. These sites may be accessed by rail or via the surrounding highway and freeway systems.

Lastly, Parks and Natural Areas such as Cathedral City Park and Baltimore Woods are lands both inside and outside the Urban Growth Boundary which are to remain undeveloped, and may include parks, streams and trail corridors, wetlands and floodplains.

St. Johns Truck Strategy (2001)

The St. Johns Truck Strategy made several recommendations for intersection and safety improvements in the St. Johns neighborhood in close proximity to our study area.

Improvements were made to the Lombard/St. Louis/Ivanhoe intersection in order to improve bicycle and pedestrian conditions while not causing significant interruptions to freight traffic flow. The intersection was re-striped and re-aligned and curb extensions were constructed.

Changes to the intersection of Philadelphia Ave. and Ivanhoe St. near the foot of the St. Johns bridge were also recommended and completed by 2012, adding signalization, curbs and sidewalks, a median and paving with the goal of improving traffic and pedestrian circulation.
Phase II of the Truck Strategy implements three of the eight sub-projects listed in this plan. According to PBOT’s website, they include two projects on St. Louis Ave. and Fessenden St., and one on Lombard St. between St. Louis and Bruce Avenues, all slightly outside of our study area.

TSP (2002 revised 2018)

The 2035 Portland Transportation System Plan (TSP) lists a number of planned infrastructure improvements in and around the Cathedral Park neighborhood, as well as a number of classifications for existing infrastructure installments.

TSP Planned Projects

An interactive map of TSP projects for all Portland neighborhoods can be accessed via the following link: http://pdx.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.

Pedestrian Classification

The St. Johns bridge is considered a City Walkway leading to downtown St Johns. Much of our study area is part of a Pedestrian District. The North Portland Greenway is an off-street path that becomes a City Walkway at Edison before continuing as an off-street path.

Pedestrian Districts give priority access to pedestrians in areas of existing or anticipated high pedestrian activity.

City Walkways provide safe and convenient access to amenities along major streets, connections between neighborhoods, and access to transit.

Off-Street Paths provide opportunities for recreation and can be used as shortcuts to urban destinations.

Bicycle Classification

Willamette Blvd. and our study section of Ivanhoe St. are considered City Bikeways with connections via Burlington St. and Richmond Ave.. Philadelphia Ave. continues onto the St. Johns bridge and beyond as a City Bikeway; while Lombard St. (continuing eastbound on Jersey St. before rejoining Lombard St.) and the unfinished North Portland Greenway are both considered Major City Bikeways.

Major City Bikeways are vital parts of the City’s bikeway network and are meant to accommodate large volumes of bicycle traffic and are intended to provide efficient travel between the city’s numerous transportation districts.

City Bikeways are intended to establish direct and convenient bicycle access to significant destinations, to provide convenient access to Major City Bikeways and to provide coverage within three city blocks of any given point.

City Bikeways provide bicycle access to significant destinations while spanning a much broader network than Major City Bikeways. They are designed to provide coverage of city streets within three city blocks of any given point. However, coverage appears sparse in the Cathedral Park neighborhood relative to other neighborhoods in the network.

Transit Classification

Lombard St. and Richmond Ave. into Willamette Blvd. are considered Major Transit Priority streets. The St. Johns bridge, parts of Ivanhoe St. (including our study area) and Willamette Blvd. to the southwest are Transit Access Streets.

Major Transit Priority Streets support frequent and reliable transit movement between Portland’s Central City as well
as regional and town centers. Transit vehicles which operate on these streets are typically either frequent service or expected to eventually achieve frequent service in order to accommodate projected growth.

Transit Access Streets provide access for transit in order to connect town centers, neighborhood centers and industrial and employment centers with nearby residential areas and other destinations as well as other transit routes. Frequency of routes is dependent on consumer demand.

**Freight Classification**

The St. Johns bridge and the western sections of Lombard St. are Regional Truckways, while Lombard St. to the southeast and our study section of Ivanhoe St. are Truck Access streets. No other roads in our study area have truck right-of-way.

Regional Truckways facilitate interregional freight travel and movement of freight.

Priority Truck Streets are the primary route for access and circulation in Freight Districts. They provide access between Freight Districts and Regional Truckways.

**St. Johns Lombard Plan (2004)**

The St. Johns Lombard Plan includes elements such as zoning changes to the Comprehensive Plan, as well as a Master Street Plan with updated pedestrian crossings, bike lanes and routes and transit network recommendations. However, as fifteen years have now passed since its implementation, elements of the plan are now considered outdated, such as planning for the MU-UC.

As part of the plan’s community engagement strategy, community members were asked to participate in "walks", where they organized into small groups and responded to questions related to issues with specific locations along the walk route. One of these walks went through our section of Ivanhoe St.; another went through part of Crawford St. and up Burlington Blvd.

For the Cathedral Park neighborhood walk, the plan noted employment and housing as “desirable” in the area close to the river, and that integrating those land uses would need to be done carefully. Community participants were in favor of maintaining industrial/employment opportunities during that time. Walk participants expressed a need to better connect the waterfront area with downtown St. Johns using “physical and visual enhancements” and connections to other areas outside the neighborhood through enhanced transit service and trails.

Planners’ notes regarding community feedback included the following:

- John St. between Decatur St. and Edison St. would be a nice pedestrian route.
- Called for improvements to Richmond Ave., Burlington St. and Baltimore Ave.
- Called for improvements to Bradford St. between St. Louis Ave. and Burlington St. and Crawford St. between Burlington St. and Richmond Ave., citing it as necessary for high density residential development mentioned in the plan and for access to the Cathedral Park area.
- Burlington St. at Willamette Blvd. is a very bad intersection. Too wide and too much paving.
- Best connections to the river are from Baltimore Ave. and Burlington St.
Portland Freight Plan (2006)

The goals of the Freight Master Plan are:

- Mobility: Ensuring Portland’s transportation system can meet growing goods demand and understanding how the transportation system can be improved for all modes of freight;

- Livability: Reducing freight impact on the community and balancing freight needs with the needs of other transportation modes; and

- Economy: Recognizing the role of goods delivery in supporting healthy and vibrant business centers, and using strategic investments in freight to support existing businesses and attract new ones.

The plan’s designations for freight routes in the neighborhood are very similar to those outlined in the TSP: The St. Johns bridge to Ivanhoe St./Lombard St. North is a Priority Truck Street; downtown Lombard St. and Ivanhoe St. to the southeast are considered Truck Access Streets; The Toyota facility is classified as a Freight Facility along with its surrounding Freight District; and the St. Johns bridge connects across the river to Bridge Ave. a Major Truck Street, and St. Helens Rd., a Regional Truck Way.

This plan includes the Ivanhoe St./Philadelphia Ave. intersection improvements from the St. Johns Truck Strategy for redesigning the intersection to improve traffic and pedestrian circulation. The improvements were completed in 2012, adding signalization, curbs and sidewalks, a median and paving with a cost of $106,904. It also includes the Lombard St./St. Louis Ave./Ivanhoe St. improvements outlined in the Truck Strategy, listed as a Tier 1 funded project for a sum of $1.4 million.

Fixing Our Streets (2016)

PBOT’s Fixing Our Streets program was a result of the passing of Measure 26-173, a first-of-its-kind gas tax dedicated to improving structural integrity and safety of Portland’s roads.

The program has resulted in improvements to our project area in four locations. All four were Base Repair projects which address streets that are in “poor or very poor” condition, repairing portions which have “failed from top to bottom.” The repairs are meant to prevent structural failures in these roads from spreading to other parts of the street, and tend to be smaller because of the increased costs of repairing both the asphalt and the street’s rock base.


The Vision Zero website includes an interactive map where vehicle-related traffic injuries involving bicycles and pedestrians ranging from 2007 to 2019 can be viewed. A brief summary of these crash data follows.

There have been four collisions involving pedestrians and two involving bicycles on Ivanhoe St. between 2007 and 2019. Of these six collisions, four occurred between Baltimore and Richmond Avenues. One was a pedestrian fatality at Ivanhoe St. and Baltimore Ave. in 2008.

There have been five collisions involving bicycles and one involving a pedestrian on Willamette Blvd. between 2007 and 2019. All of these occurred on the striped portion of Willamette Blvd. between Richmond and Ida Avenues. One of these was a pedestrian fatality near Burr Ave. in 2018.
Other notable incidents include an injury involving a bicycle at Burlington Ave. and Syracuse St. in 2007, an injury involving a pedestrian on Richmond Ave. near Syracuse St. in 2008, and an injury involving a bicycle at the intersection of Edison St. and Trumbull Ave. in 2008.

Of the bicycle and pedestrian-related traffic incidents in the neighborhood since 2007, the majority have occurred on the streets of significance to our study, namely Willamette Blvd., Ivanhoe St. and Richmond Ave.

Safe Routes to School (2018)

The Safe Routes to School Project Planning Interactive Map recommends one crosswalk improvement project at the intersection of Willamette Blvd. and Alta Ave. It is currently unfunded and has a projected cost of $18,500.

Three other recommendations for marked crosswalks in the region exist on Lombard/Jersey St.; all three are unfunded and range in cost from $3,000 to $18,500. Though slightly outside of our study area, the Lombard St. improvements lie between our study area and James John Elementary, which is expected to see increased enrollment and subsequent bicycle and pedestrian traffic from the Cathedral Park neighborhood in the coming years.

PedPDX (2018-present)

The PedPDX Pedestrian priority network is similar in nature to the network outlined by the TSP, though it uses slightly different classifications. Lombard St, Willamette Blvd., Philadelphia Ave./the St. Johns Bridge and the North Portland Greenway are all considered part of the Major City Walkway network. Burlington and Baltimore Avenues, and Ivanhoe St., Decatur and Bradford Streets are all considered City Walkways, though Bradford St is not a through street.

Major City Walkways have numerous nearby transit and land use destinations and have high pedestrian use. They are generally located on main streets, neighborhood corridors and frequent transit networks as well as core downtown areas such as downtown St. Johns.

City Walkways are typically located on major traffic streets, collectors and streets with transit service not already designated as Major City Walkways, and serve moderate pedestrian demand. They may also include off-street trails, though much of the planned North Portland Greenway is actually designated a Major City Walkway.

Neighborhood Walkways serve neighborhood-level demand and may include Safe Routes to School routes, neighborhood greenways, and local streets identified in area plans as priority walking routes. They may also include neighborhood trails and paths designated as within the public right-of-way.

The Pedestrian District overlay represents areas of additional pedestrian demand, and indicate areas designated by the 2035 Comprehensive Plan as “centers” where high levels of pedestrian activity exist or are expected to form in the future. The PedPDX Pedestrian District is much larger compared to the pedestrian district designated by the TSP, reaching the Waterfront and Cathedral City Park regions.
APPENDIX D

Glossary of Terms

PBOT - Portland Bureau of Transportation

ODOT - Oregon Department of Transportation

MU-UC (Per the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, pg. GP10-7) - The Mixed Use - Urban Center designation is intended for areas that are close to the Central City and within Town Centers where urban public services are available or planned including access to high capacity transit, very frequent bus service, or streetcar service. The designation allows a broad range of commercial and employment uses, public services, and a wide range of housing options. Areas within this designation are generally mixed use and very urban in character. Development will be pedestrian-oriented with a strong emphasis on design and street level activity, and will range from low- to mid-rise in scale. The range of zones and development scale associated with this designation are intended to allow for more intense development in core areas of centers and corridors and near transit stations, while providing transitions to adjacent residential areas. The corresponding zones are Commercial Mixed Use 1 (CM1), Commercial Mixed Use 2 (CM2), Commercial Mixed Use 3 (CM3), and Commercial Employment (CE). This designation is generally accompanied by a design overlay zone.

LID (Local Improvement District) - A mechanism in which property owners can share in the costs of infrastructure improvements.

Active transportation (Per the Transportation System Plan from PBOT) - Transportation that involves physical activity, including walking, biking and using transit.

Mobility (Per the Transportation System Plan from PBOT) - The ability to move people and goods from place to place, or the potential for movement.

Mobility device - Wheelchair, walker, electric wheelchair, etc.

Equity (Per the 2018 Regional Transportation Plan - Transportation Equity Evaluation from Metro) - The removal of barriers to eliminate transportation-related disparities faced by and improves equitable outcomes for historically marginalized communities, especially communities of color.

Travel Modes - Ways the people interact with the transportation system. Typically defined as walking, bicycle, bus, train, carpool, and personal vehicle.

Treatment - This is a solution designed to address a transportation problem, e.g. speed bumps, circulator shuttle, and bike lanes.

TAC - Technical Advisory Committee - This is a group of professionals with expertise in transportation planning that provided comments and insights on our recommendations.
**Traffic Diverter** (Per the City of Berkeley website) - A roadway design feature which is placed upon a street or roadway in order to prohibit vehicular traffic from entering into, or exiting from a street.

**Neighborhood Greenway** (per the PBOT website) - Residential streets designed to prioritize bicycling and enhance conditions for walking. The City of Portland has adopted the following operational performance guidelines:

- Traffic speeds of 20 mph or less
- A goal of 1,000 cars per day with no more than 2,000 cars
- There should be ample opportunities for people bicycling and walking to cross busy streets, at least 50 crossing opportunities per hour, with 100 crossing opportunities per hour the preferred level of service.

**Curb extension** (Per the National Association of City Transportation Officials) - Curb extensions visually and physically narrow the roadway, creating safer and shorter crossings for pedestrians while increasing the available space for street furniture, benches, plantings, and street trees. They may be implemented on downtown, neighborhood, and residential streets, large and small.

**Switchback** (Based on the definition on access-board.gov site) - A switchback is a series of connected ramps and landings that allow users to move up or down a steep hill at a more gentle slope.
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