



## **Metro**

### **People places • open spaces**

Clean air and clean water do not stop at city limits or county lines. Neither does the need for jobs, a thriving economy and good transportation choices for people and businesses in our region. Voters have asked Metro to help with the challenges that cross those lines and affect the 25 cities and three counties in the Portland metropolitan area.

A regional approach simply makes sense when it comes to protecting open space, caring for parks, planning for the best use of land, managing garbage disposal and increasing recycling. Metro oversees world-class facilities such as the Oregon Zoo, which contributes to conservation and education, and the Oregon Convention Center, which benefits the region's economy.

### **Your Metro representatives**

Metro Council President – David Bragdon

Metro Councilors – Rod Park, deputy council president, District 1; Brian Newman, District 2; Carl Hosticka, District 3; Kathryn Harrington, District 4; Rex Burkholder, District 5; Robert Liberty, District 6.

Auditor – Suzanne Flynn

Metro's web site: [www.metro-region.org](http://www.metro-region.org)

Project web site: [www.metro-region.org/rtp](http://www.metro-region.org/rtp) (Click on "2035 RTP update")

*The preparation of this report was financed in part by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration. The opinions, findings and conclusions expressed in this report are not necessarily those of the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration.*

# 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Update

## Stakeholder Engagement Report

This is a report from the Metropolitan Group (MG) to Metro summarizing the results of stakeholder meetings conducted by MG for Metro in the fall of 2006. The stakeholder meetings were part of Metro's larger public involvement strategy for the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. The larger strategy called for engaging community and public interests through community forums, scientific public opinion research, comment cards and web feedback, business and community group presentations, on-going Metro advisory committee meetings, public review and comment periods, and targeted stakeholder meetings. MG facilitated all stakeholder meetings, and worked with Metro staff to recruit participants and develop the meeting format.

The primary goal of the stakeholder meetings was to gather information from community interest groups and individuals to inform development of an updated RTP policy framework that would be used to guide development of the rest of the plan. A secondary goal was to ascertain the public's understanding of connections between transportation choices and the land use outcomes reflected in the 2040 Growth Concept. A scientific public opinion survey was conducted in January 2007, building on these discussions.<sup>1</sup>

The meetings were designed to provide an opportunity for groups with a focus on a particular public interest or public responsibility to discuss transportation needs and goals for the region's transportation system in depth. The meetings were also designed to actively engage people who historically have not been well represented in transportation planning and decision-making in the Portland metropolitan region.

### Meeting structure and participants

Nine workshops were held in the fall of 2006, involving 127 individuals and 50 different community organizations and government entities. Four of the workshops were held with existing public entities to engage elected officials and professionals who play a role in planning and operating the region's transportation system: the Metro Council and Metro advisory committees—the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)<sup>2</sup>, the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)<sup>3</sup>, the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC)<sup>4</sup> and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC)<sup>5</sup>. The other five workshops were held with community and business interest group recruited especially for these workshops. The interest groups are briefly described below, with more details in Appendix A.

### Freight and business

This workshop assembled employers and individuals involved in area businesses, industries, agriculture and organizations related to the movement of freight and goods throughout the region. This group included representatives of Metro's Regional Freight and Goods Movement Task Force, Washington Counties Rural Roads Operations and Maintenance Advisory Committee (RROMAC), the Portland Visitor's Association, Oregon Trucking Association and the Westside Business Alliance.

---

<sup>1</sup> The RTP Public Opinion Research Report is available to download on Metro's website at <http://www.metro-region.org/article.cfm?ArticleID=19896>.

<sup>2</sup> JPACT is a 17-member committee composed elected officials and transportation agency representatives.

<sup>3</sup> TPAC is a 21-member committee that provides technical input to the JPACT. TPAC consists of technical staff from governments around the region and 6 community representatives.

<sup>4</sup> MPAC is a 28-member charter-mandated committee of local government representatives and community representatives that consults on policy issues. Three of the 28 members are community representatives.

<sup>5</sup> MTAC provides technical advise to MPAC. MTAC is composed of planning staff from the governments and agencies represented on MPAC.

### **Active living**

This workshop assembled professionals, academics and individuals who are interested in the connection between transportation and public health. Participants were drawn from health departments and nonprofit organizations, such as Elders in Action, Active Living-Healthy Eating Partnership, Salud!, Oregon Institute on Disability and Development (OHSU), Oregon Department of Health Services, and Multnomah County Health Department.

### **Transportation equity**

Two workshops were focused on transportation equity. One workshop recruited low-income residents of North Portland through the Environmental Justice Action Group, to bring to the discussion the perspective of urban dwellers who may have reasonably good access to a variety of transportation choices, but who may have safety concerns or other priorities. The other workshop, conducted in Spanish at Centro Cultural in Cornelius, included individuals living in an area of the region with the largest, and growing concentration of Latino residents with limited transportation choices. The discussions focused on the transportation priorities of day laborers and agricultural workers who work at jobs that may change location from day to day and who may live in areas that do not offer viable transportation choices.

### **Community and environmental health**

This workshop worked with the Coalition for a Livable Future (CLF) to engage representatives from a broad range of transportation advocacy groups, environmental protection groups and community-based organizations. In addition to the CLF parent organization, member organizations participating included Oregon Sustainable Agriculture Land Trust (OSALT), Sierra Club, Better People, League of Women Voters, Bicycle Transportation Alliance, and Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates (AORTA).

### **Meeting format**

The meetings used an outcomes-based approach, asking participants to consider how transportation could help achieve goals expressed in the 2040 Growth Concept—a healthy economy, vibrant communities, healthy environment, transportation choices, and equity across age, income and abilities.

For the workshop engaging targeted community interests, the five goals provided a topical organization for small discussion groups. Each discussion group was asked to answer the following questions from the perspective of its chosen 2040 goal.

1. What would the region's transportation system look like if the goals were achieved?
2. What is working well now with respect to the goals?
3. What are some challenges to achieving the goals?
4. What are some solutions?
5. What is something you do/do not want to see as a result of transportation planning?

The full group then discussed potential funding mechanisms for implementing projects and programs needed to achieve their goals.

The workshops held with existing entities—the Metro Council, MPAC, TPAC, and MTAC—were conducted as a whole-group discussion focused on the healthy economy, vibrant communities and fiscal stewardship goals.

### **Discussion highlights**

The targeted workshops yielded a rich assortment of visions, perspectives, solutions and experiences to aid in developing the policy framework. Highlighted responses to the discussion

questions are presented below, followed by summaries of important circumstances and concerns that emerged from the discussions. Comments compiled from workshop flip charts are attached as Appendix C.

**What would the region's transportation system look like if the goals were achieved?**

- *Travel options and mode balance:* All members of the community would have easy access to a balance of transportation modes. Responses across all groups indicate exceptionally strong support for a multi-modal transportation system that offers easy, affordable access to people of all incomes, ages and abilities.
- *Community design:* Mixed-use zoning would place homes in proximity to stores, schools, parks, jobs and entertainment. Built environment would encourage social interaction and support local businesses. Children and youth would be able to safely cycle or walk to school.
- *Environmental protection:* Transportation and land-use would preserve agricultural lands and natural resources. Facilities would be designed to protect water quality, fish habitat and wildlife corridors.
- *Work housing balance:* Employment would be located near where people live. Businesses would have access to employees, and commuting times would be minimized.
- *Connectivity between modes and on roads and streets:* The system would facilitate good connections between all modes of travel for people as well as freight. Streets would be connected to facilitate ease of travel within communities as well as between centers. Transit would connect suburban centers with each other as well as with the central city.
- *Safety:* Safety would be a priority. Safety means both crash prevention and personal safety for people using mass transit or other public facilities. Trails and paths would offer safe off-road routes for cycles and pedestrians. Community sidewalks would be well connected and well lit.
- *Cooperation among various agencies and jurisdictions:* Agencies and jurisdictions, public and private entities would work together to identify, fund and implement regional priorities.
- *Travel reliability:* Truck, car, bus or light rail travelers would be able to predict within reason how long their trip will take.
- *Community involvement and decision-making transparency:* Planners and decision-makers would actively engage a broad spectrum of community interests throughout the transportation planning and decision-making process.
- *Well-maintained system operating at maximum efficiency:* Roads and bridges would reflect that maintenance and preservation are priorities, and smart technologies would maximize operational efficiency. Road incidents would receive a rapid response.
- *Freight movement:* Freight networks would be preserved, with access to facilities for easy transfer between air, road, rail and water.

### What is currently working well?

- *Mass transit:* Investments in mass transit, in particular light rail and streetcars, have helped to support land use, environmental and other goals. Transit has worked so well, it is often too crowded.
- *Transportation Management Associations (TMAs):* Programs such as the Swan Island TMA have helped reduce congestion and improved ability of employees to get to work on time.
- *Bike and pedestrian improvements:* Efforts to focus programs and projects have resulted in more bike facilities and sidewalk connections. This region has developed a national bike-friendly reputation.
- *Regional system planning:* Although not always perfect, having regional planning and a regional vision driving planning efforts was working well overall. Connecting land use with transportation investments has resulted in good transit-oriented developments.
- *Spot successes in town centers:* Town centers are developing in some areas and resulting in vibrant communities.
- *Information technologies:* Traveler information has helped commuters and truckers plan travel and pick routes to avoid bad weather and accidents.

### What are the challenges to achieving the goals?

- *Funding:* Limited funds are preventing valuable projects from being completed and forcing trade offs between maintenance and construction to handle growth. Federal and state funding sources are often inflexible in how they may be invested. The gas tax alone cannot support needed investments in the region's transportation system.
- *Understanding/public education:* The broader public does not understand transportation issues, especially funding. Some people have unrealistic expectations for transit service.
- *Tradition:* The inherited built environment and traditional ways of thinking are obstacles. Developments built in the 1960s and 1970s reflect an auto-dependent way of thinking common at the time and are difficult to change now. Many do not have sidewalks or connecting streets.
- *Outmoded community design:* Especially in suburban areas, the existing built environment challenges easy or affordable solutions to improving connectivity for all modes of travel.
- *Coordination/cooperation:* Local governments and agencies fall short when it comes to viewing the region as a whole and to coordinating and cooperating on regional efforts. Especially in a climate of restricted funding, competition rather than cooperation results—and is sometimes rewarded.
- *Railroad policies and practices:* Current laws, policies and practices challenge efforts that involve private rail companies. Passenger rail is not a federal priority.
- *Housing costs in compact urban centers:* Rising costs in the core city push lower income people to more remote parts of the region. Jobs are often in the core city.
- *Safety perceptions:* The world is perceived as being more dangerous, especially for children and seniors, which discourages use of public facilities.
- *Cultural bias toward individualism over common good:* Individualism isolates people, reduces commitment to support public facilities and fosters single-occupancy vehicle use.

### What are solutions for achieving the goals?

- *Education:* Public education on transportation issues such as funding sources and gaps, and the true cost of transportation including externalities such as environmental costs would improve understanding of priorities and the chance of developing needed funding. Education promotes more informed, effective public involvement in transportation planning.
- *Better coordination/cooperation:* The region needs to be more creative in developing funding strategies. Agencies, jurisdictions, public and private entities need to work together to raise funds to fund projects that reflect a regional vision. Likewise, different modes should be treated as complementary—not one against the other.
- *Land use and non-transportation solutions:* Invest in redevelopment of centers, encourage compact development, zone for mixed use and support transit-oriented development (TOD) projects and Regional Travel Options (RTO) programs.
- *Funding efficiency and priorities:* Improve efficiency in how current transportation funds are used, with priorities on improving freight mobility, improving access to transit, and providing more travel options. Consider congestion pricing and tolls.
- *Community involvement:* Provide for more regional, stakeholder and public involvement to solve transportation challenges.
- *Intelligent transportation systems:* Research and invest in technology that can help manage congestion and squeeze maximum efficiency out of the existing system.

### What would you like to see as a result of transportation planning?

- *Expanded high-capacity transit:* The wish list included suburban light rail service; neighborhood transit service; express light rail service or bus rapid transit; and more-frequent bus service with expanded service hours.
- *More and safer pedestrian facilities:* Longer walk lights and more crosswalks at transit stops; more sidewalks throughout the region, and sidewalks that connect to transit and other community destinations.
- *Freight improvement:* Network of dedicated freight routes, freight movement appreciated as a cornerstone of economic vitality.
- *Maintenance and small fixes first:* Take care of what we have before investing in new facilities; make least expensive fixes before moving to more expensive fixes.
- *Multimodal routes:* New facilities should include capacity for other transportation modes.

### What would you not like to see as a result of transportation planning?

- *A system organized only around the central city:* The suburban areas have large employment centers and have been growing in population.
- *Economic development sacrificed to focus on urban form or economic opportunities limited by lack of transportation options.*
- *Success leading to a lack of affordable housing.*
- *Gridlock.* Peak hours routinely experience gridlock.
- *Adverse impacts of transportation investments concentrated in poor neighborhoods.*

### ***Other important concerns***

During some of the workshop discussions, certain perspectives, concerns and circumstances affecting particular populations or interests emerged that may be important in policy development.

*Transportation access on the edge of the urban growth boundary:* Participants recruited through Centro Cultural describe transportation challenges related to their location at the edge of the urban growth boundary coupled with job, school and family needs. They cited widespread lack of access to mass transit or to other options—bike lanes, sidewalks or trails. Many families in that area cannot afford to live closer to town centers and are unable to afford to own or operate a car. The population facing these conditions has grown as housing closer to town has become more expensive.

*Transportation facilities and human health:* Asthma and other related respiratory problems were a daily concern for people living in North Portland near I-5, where the freeway routinely becomes congested. At the time of the workshop, the media carried stories about inordinately high benzene concentrations in the air from vehicle emissions, which heightened concerns about the effects of air quality on human health.

*New road capacity to relieve congestion and to serve developing areas:* New and newly developing areas in the urban growth boundary do not have the roads they need to support planned development, unlike older and more established parts of the region. They need to be treated differently than older, more established parts of the region. Also, some existing roads and highways are already out of capacity, especially freight routes. New or added capacity will also need new funding strategies and partnerships.

### **Conclusions**

The primary purpose of the workshops was to elicit information from representative public interests to help inform development of an updated policy framework for the 2035 RTP. A secondary purpose was to assess public perception of the land-use transportation connection. The workshops revealed that most people understand the connection between land use and transportation systems with regard to job access, personal convenience, preservation of agricultural lands, and ability to provide better-developed transportation systems and more mode choices. The perspectives and priorities that emerged through the discussion exercises suggest considering the following information when updating the RTP Policy Framework.

### ***Policy framework considerations***

- People of all incomes and in all parts of the region need transportation choices to access academic and economic opportunity, community events and meet their daily needs. Populations of low-income people with complex transportation needs report that high housing prices near city centers have forced them to relocate in less accessible parts of the region that do not offer many transportation choices. These needs suggest that policies should address equity issues.
- Transportation and land use planning impacts human health. Active living is a growing movement that stresses physical activity as important for health promotion and disease prevention. This suggests the need for policies that recognize the connection between transportation system and land use designs and the ability of people of all ages, incomes and physical abilities to maximize physical activity in getting from place to place. The policies should also link this to other goals for clean air and protecting the natural environment.
- Managing congestion was a high priority for business interests and freight haulers as well as for individuals and groups concerned about the effects of vehicle emissions on human health. Fiscal practicalities that emerged during the discussion on funding trends suggest the need for policies to encourage creative solutions to manage



congestion - including land use strategies, technologies that improve traffic flows, new public/private partnerships to raise new revenues to fund needed investments.

- Completing transportation connections within and between centers and between modes was seen as supporting local businesses and the economy, spreading transportation demand and thereby improving the efficiency of the overall system, improving personal convenience and increasing overall access and mobility. The variations in regional geography combined with historic development patterns in established areas compared with the very different needs of developing areas that policies be flexible and not "one size fits all."
- Protecting and restoring the environment was a high priority for people across interest groups, suggesting RTP policies should continue to emphasize the importance of environmental considerations during planning and project development processes to recognize the impact of transportation and land use planning on the health of the natural environment.

This page intentionally left blank.

## Appendix A: Stakeholder Workshop Participants

**Event:** Active Living Workshop

**Date:** 10/27/06

**Time:** 1:30 – 3:30 PM

**Location:** Metro Regional Services  
600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR

### Organizations represented

Portland State University  
Elders in Action  
Healthy Eating, Active Living (HEAL) Partnership  
Metro  
Ride Connection  
Bicycle Transportation Alliance/Willamette Pedestrian Coalition  
Oregon Health & Science University  
Community Cycling Center  
Oregon Department of Human Services  
Linfield College  
Tuality Health Care (Salud!)  
Multnomah County Health Department  
Additional interested/unaffiliated individuals

**Event:** Freight and Business

**Date:** 10/30/06

**Time:** 9:00 – 11:00 AM **Location:** Metro Regional Services  
600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, OR

### Organizations represented

Portland Community College  
Washington County Rural Roads Operations and Maintenance Advisory Committee (RROMAC)  
Waste Management, Inc.  
Truck Transportation System  
Columbia Corridor Association  
Oregon Trucking Association  
Community Newspapers (Portland Tribune)  
Providence Health System  
Portland General Electric  
Portland Oregon Visitors Association  
Institutional Facilities Coalition  
Flexcar  
East Multnomah County Economic Alliance  
Westside Economic Alliance  
Port of Portland  
Ball Janik, LLP

## Appendix A – Stakeholder Workshop Participants

---

**Event:** Coalition for a Livable Future (CLF)

**Date:** 10/03/06

**Time:** 6:30 – 8:30

**Location:** People's Co-op  
3029 SE 21<sup>st</sup> Ave., Portland, OR

**Organizations represented**

Oregon Sustainable Land Trust (OSALT)

Unaffiliated

Sierra Club

CLF

Congressman Earl Blumenauer's Office

Sierra Club

League of Women Voters/CRR

Healthy Eating, Active Living

Better People

Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates (AORTA)

League of Women Voters/CRR

Bicycle Transportation Alliance

CLF

CLF

Plus interested/unaffiliated individuals

**Event: Transportation Equity**

**Date:** October 28, 2007

**Time:** 9:30-noon

**Location:** Centro Cultural  
110 N. Michigan Adair  
Cornelius, Oregon

**Organizations represented**

Centro Cultural

(Workshop conducted in Spanish)

**Event: Environmental Justice**

**Date:** December 6, 2007

**Time:** 6:00-8:00 p.m.

**Location:** The Plaza Townhomes  
5802 N. Michigan St.  
Portland, Oregon

**Organizations represented**

Environmental Justice Action Group

The Plaza Homeowners Association

Humboldt Neighborhood Association

## **Appendix B: Compilation of Stakeholder Workshop Comment**

**Question 1: What would the region's transportation system look like if the outcomes were achieved?**

### **COMMUNITY SHAPE/FUNCTION**

- Transportation is a means for achieving vibrant communities
- Transportation infrastructure in shared public spaces – including streets
- Balance between new developments' paying fair share (more) with gas tax inflation escalator (currently artificially set fees rather than capacity)
- Sense of place
- Places people like to be and stay awhile
- Conversations on sidewalk
- Meet people, have dinner – pleasant environment
- Active/vibrant street life
- Variety human activities over 18 hours a day in the central city; 12 hour in town centers
- Built environment provides social fabric and network
- Livable, dense neighborhood; hubs that connect people to transit, services, community
- Complete communities that are linked to each other
- Compact communities (housing, child care, jobs)
- Places where people can work and live in close proximity
- Concentrated uses – not strung out spatially to make easier to get to
- Town centers – living closer to work
- Destinations (jobs, housing, services) are there
- Services closer
- Transportation facilities built to meet individual location requirements
- Transportation infrastructure is beautiful – roads bridges, culverts, etc., “place – making
- Public streetscape – urban living room – are designed well, pedestrian and other modes, beautiful
- Good transportation access to jobs; quick access from home to work, everyday services (for example, to the grocery store) (12)
- Helsinki, but warmer
- Don't destroy communities with capacity
- Concentrate in urban areas

### **Demographics**

- System that recognizes/accommodates dual-worker households
- Rich demographic make up (diversity: age, income and cultures) (2)

### **Housing Affordability**

- Transportation system doesn't inflate/displace property values for people and business
- Affordable housing across the region

### **Mobility/Commuting**

- Work travel time reasonable (3)
- Less need for long-distance travel
- Work in place without long commute;
- Able to live near work
- Easy transit access
- Growth will add to congestion; need to manage using information technology

### **Economic Vitality**

- Jobs/housing balance
- Healthy business community
- Retail that is supported by mixed-use

## Appendix B: Compilation of Stakeholder Workshop Comments

### Question 1: What would the region's transportation system look like if the outcomes were achieved?

- Need places to expand business link to workforce
- Businesses and services within easy access to market area – walk/bike – proximity
- Analyze and focus resources to chosen business sectors
- Money stays in the local economy; local business
- Job security, more jobs that are year round
- Family wage jobs with benefits
- Human talent drives healthy economy
- Enable development of workforce; new economic opportunities not just good schools
- Transportation designed to facility connections to job/industrial areas and centers
- People and goods free to move within region and to other regions – within an economic corridor
- Responsibility of region to support State and Pacific Northwest economy needs (I-5, I-84, Port access)
- Transportation system is invisible – like public facilities (in background)

#### TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM/FACILITIES/SERVICE

- Multiple transportation choices that work for individuals, different lifestyles and the region as a whole (for jobs and recreation)(4)
- More alternative modes (for example, bicycle) to free capacity for other users of system (passenger and freight)
- More transportation options to cars (9)
- Mix, diversity, balance but focus on certain sectors
- More options at all hours in regional centers and town centers
- More special needs services including aging population (2)
- Alternatives for private transit
- Neighborhood shuttles to access fixed-route transit
- Better options specifically for people commuting to work – workforce is drawn regionally (2)
- Local trips are off major facilities
- Transportation system predictable – electronic signage, incident response
- Accessible to all people especially transit (7)
- More points of access bus routes on all major streets
- Could get anywhere (rural areas, w/in smaller cities and towns) conveniently via transit (4)
- User-friendly / convenient system
- Enhanced interconnectivity
- Feeder buses; park & ride; design; removing physical barriers
- Improved transit services
- Non-transportation solutions for transportation problems
- Barrier free (including disadvantaged) (3)
- Expanding modes – freight as well passenger
- Invest inter-modally – increase opportunities
- Use of river for transport

#### Cost

- Transportation is smaller share of family budget (5)
- Don't need expensive transportation improvements
- Higher priority should be on maintaining system before building new; require to identify/maintain roads for 20 years
- Maximizing existing system can disenfranchise segments of community because of radial focus – need to clearly cost/benefits of next increment of investment
- Investing to technology that puts money into things that maximizes existing system

## **Appendix B: Compilation of Stakeholder Workshop Comments**

### **Question 1: What would the region's transportation system look like if the outcomes were achieved?**

#### **Service**

- Options shouldn't require sacrifice; options should be competitive in time and convenience
- Predictable/reliable time to use a given mode (3)
- Transit service more frequent and for more hours (3)
- Information available about all modes

#### **Connectivity/Access**

- Complete HCT transit, bike network to reduce commuter demand on key roadways
- Connectivity between suburban communities, (including bi-state) (4)
- Direct line from outlying communities to Portland
- Transportation system connects across region (3)
- Network of transportation corridors; "spider web" – with multiple connections
- Smooth connections between modes (freight and people)
- Ability to walk between bus/train stops – close proximity between modes
- Linkages within communities and services to parks, recreational opportunities (5)
- Reduce segmentation
- No "bridges to nowhere"
- Connection to amenities; access town centers
- Infrastructure, including parking, ensure linkage

#### **Safety**

- All modes are reliable and safe (2)
- Feel safe anywhere
- More security at transit centers, bus stops – trains/buses, etc.
- Safety – transit; a big piece – perception
- Lighting and sidewalks (2)
- Improve safety – lighting and sidewalks
- Bikes are not safe (safety for everyone); better standards
- "Rules of the road" – drivers test every five years
- Things would be slower – built environment would be designed for safety
- Good management of emergency response

#### **System Operation**

- Technology used to make existing system more efficient
- Focusing on what we have/optimize the current system
- Balancing full utilization of road system with redundancy for issues; for example, Burnside can function as an alternative to Hwy 26
- Less congested system (3)
- Investing to technology that puts money into things that maximizes existing system

#### **Freeways/Highways/Roads**

- System freeway/major arterials reliable reasonable travel time
- Roadway network that serves business and residents (priority for different use)
- Local trips on local streets and through trips on inter-city facilities
- No new highways/fewer highway miles
- Updated highways and bridges; widening; serve trucks; improve I-205
- No more lanes on I-5
- Cut through traffic in neighborhood to avoid I-5 congestion
- Consider access to new and developing areas
- Use of system allocated, for example using tolls

## **Appendix B: Compilation of Stakeholder Workshop Comments**

### **Question 1: What would the region's transportation system look like if the outcomes were achieved?**

- Rural roads need maintenance

#### **Transit**

- Adequate public and transit system
- MAX at all corners of Metro region/ light rail system extended
- Max out MAX transit – full and available
- Full busses (it annoys people when they aren't full)
- Incentives for transit
- More secure places for buses to pull over
- Travel time competitiveness over other cities complete transit network; especially light rail

#### **Freight**

- Choice for freight – rail, truck, etc.
- Consider freight-only lanes
- Freight network protected
- Freight can move without impacting neighborhoods
- Goods and services (and service providers) moving within economy in reasonable time

#### **Bike/Pedestrian**

- Kids safely biking/ walking to schools, services, etc. (5)
- Pedestrian infrastructure/ Complete sidewalk network (6)
- Bike paths
- Bike lanes on local lanes; better bike facilities
- Pedestrian/ bicycle could get around; decrease pedestrian/ bike deaths
- Incentives for biking

#### **ENVIRONMENT**

- Land preservation
- Transportation doesn't disturb wildlife/ habitat and restore and enhance access to parks and natural open spaces
- Less land covered by transportation
- Wise use of land (in transportation context)
- Beyond agriculture (value statement)
- Clean air, less asthma (2)
- Less diesel pollution
- Water, air, ground, biological beings would be cleaner – fewer toxins
- Less storm water run-off
- Less dependency on fossil fuel energy
- Environmentally sound infrastructure purchases
- Preserve agricultural/ forest land so new capacity not needed
- Prioritize sustainable system elements
- Fewer gasoline-powered vehicles; move cleaner vehicles
- Increase use of alternative transportation to decrease CO<sub>2</sub>
- Trip not taken – reduce trips
- Predictability in land-use planning to ensure that agricultural/ forestry lands be retained

#### **EDUCATION/OUTREACH**

- Information provided to demonstrate to public imp of
- Way to convey what people get from what they pay from system
- Understanding of total costs – currently maintenance is deferred? Decreased? (better feedback loop of costs and maintenance)
- Removing attitudinal barriers



## **Appendix B: Compilation of Stakeholder Workshop Comments**

### **Question 1: What would the region's transportation system look like if the outcomes were achieved?**

#### **COORDINATION/COOPERATION**

- Coordination among regional service providers
- Ongoing cooperation with outlying systems; coordination with regard to land use
- Need density too, to facilitate transportation system – work together
- More integrated, inter-agency planning occurs (institutions/public/private)
- Coming to regional consensus then sticking to it – not go off on own
- Well-coordinated system
  - Inter- and intra-agency
  - Projects/ programs/ operations

#### **POLICY/DECISION-MAKING**

- Policies where people using the system most, pay most (car weight)
- Efficiency of vehicles (90% of peak-hour trips not freight) – reduce SOVs during peak hours
- Policy making bus more attractive
- Transportation policy to increase density and encourage mixed use, for example rail
- State government that recognizes urban needs are different
- Require to identify / maintain roads for 20 years
- Land use and transportation must be tied
- Prioritizing between centers, industrial areas (based on land use)
- New Look should define land-use priorities
- Long-term view
- Projects prioritized based on most mobility for the dollar across modes
- Projects prioritized based on economic contribution
- Projects prioritized based on transportation need, not land use
- Projects prioritized based on investments in centers/corridors
- Network of modes more deliberate hierarchy—multimodal to local
- The system is well maintained; maintenance is prioritized over new construction (5)
- Maximizing existing system can disenfranchise segments of community because of radial focus – need clear cost/benefit of next increment of investment
- Incentives for change (pay to drive lane)
- Do more with less
- List of burdens and benefits
- Planning period should be double what it is
- Need clear vision; the focus of the RTP should be clearly defined
- Transparency in decision-making
- Infrastructure purchases are from local producers
- Equitable distribution of resources
- Reality scenario—for example, improving 217
- Money dedicated to operate what we have
- Government that take ROI approach, not engineering approach
- Transparent participation

#### **FUNDING**

- More investment in bus system; everyone has a part in economy
- Diverse funding sources and flexibility on how to spend
- Recapture increased value of land that has resulted from transportation investment – tax increment financing
- Realistic fiscal environment around land development
- More flexible funding sources to help under served populations
- Fiscal Environment is key – limits regional choices
- Fiscal transparency
- Fiscal responsibility distributed equitably

## **Appendix B: Compilation of Stakeholder Workshop Comments**

**Question 1: What would the region's transportation system look like if the outcomes were achieved?**

- Balance between new development's paying more fair share with gas tax inflation escalator (currently artificially set fees rather than capacity)

### **OTHER**

- Childcare at facilities for all types of employment
- Synergy of elements

## **Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments**

### **Question 2: What is working well to achieve the outcomes?**

#### **COMMUNITY SHAPE/FUNCTION**

- Towncenter concept (4)
- 2040 concept (2)
- Fareless square
- Regional centers are catching on
- Addressing plan for redevelopment
- Emphasis on design
- Growth sometimes limits choices – time spent deciding best solution for individuals
- Looking at innovative models outside U.S. (Amsterdam, Vancouver, BC)
- Technically better at identifying needs using multiple criteria
- Support to TMA's
- RTO program
- New Columbia –more thought to what is needed to create complete communities
- Selling transportation as the framework that knits communities together–physical activity, elderly and disabled - to make it easier for people to get around and the end is the social aspect—i.e.,
- “places” that are created by investments in public good
- Good developments – “spot” success in creating vibrant communities; new and existing neighborhoods (not uniform)
- On the forefront nationally for developing livable communities
- Diverse support for community improvements – businesses and cultural communities
- Local (small) improvements to address site specific issues or problems
- Increased density (2)
- Building compact communities
- Connecting transportation to livability, E.G., MTIP
- Nonprofits filling gaps—e.g., Ride Connection
- Nonprofits
- People are being fed
- Supports housing/jobs/services together
- 2040 central city growth in housing
- Urban renewal
- Transit oriented developments
- Transportation/land-use; these are the people creating community

#### **Mobility/Commuting**

- Decreased emphasis on just moving traffic from A to B
- Transit system works well (5)
- Trail system is a good start to building a multi-modal system – important in areas of density
- Accessibility has improved, especially for elderly and disabled (3)
- Infrastructure improvements
- Role model for rural communities to provide transit options – linkages to accessing the city
- Milwaukie efforts (trails, mixed-use, streetscape)
- Hillsboro is good example of a complete community

#### **Economic Vitality**

- Swan Island
- Lloyd District
- Initial understanding of connecting transportation and economy (region, state, PNW)
- Not run like a business – identification of costs/benefits
- On Interstate MAX, Tri Met used strategies to hire local contractors, fore example by breaking large tasks into smaller contracts

## **Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments**

### **Question 2: What is working well to achieve the outcomes?**

- Acceptance of new ideas – innovation
- Looking at demand side
- Urban renewal and other financing strategies
- Leveraging resources
- Light rail investment spurring new development
- Transportation investments are attracting businesses, which is good for economy
- Awareness of local production of goods reduces transportation demand and helps local economy

#### **TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS/FACILITIES/SERVICE**

- Car sharing (alternative to single-occupancy vehicle use)
- Inter-model
- Willingness to invest in alternative modes
- Alternatives (technology)
- Building off existing successes
- Transit (money to operate for 20 years)
- Prioritization of maintenance
- 16 frequent service corridors have produced gains in riders and satisfaction
- Meals on Wheels

#### **Connectivity/Access**

- Street connectivity requirements
- Interconnected trail system
- Ability to get in and out of region

#### **Safety**

- Safe routes to schools/improving safety for kids (2)

#### **Operations**

- Success of TMAs and strategies to add capacity through TRAVELSMART (low cost solutions that can be expanded)
- Changing routes to avoid accidents
- Clearing accidents
- Traveler information to reduce congestion (3)
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) work well for amount invested and cooperation between jurisdictions

#### **Freeways/Highways/Roads**

- Boulevard treatments on state highways
- Less emphasis on expanding road capacity
- Helps to not have beltways
- Great street network in some parts that we need to build on

#### **Transit**

- Complex decision-making process about transit choices
- MAX (4)
- MAX works well – helps community, housing
- Streetcar (3)
- Light rail to airport
- Growth in transit travel
- Share parking/to use for transit
- Frequent service buses
- More/better bus routes/service, express (4)
- Re-routing routes to include destinations people want to get to
- Fareless square – encourages people to try/ride transit

## **Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments**

### **Question 2: What is working well to achieve the outcomes?**

- TriMet focused investments on fewer corridors
- Access to transportation
- Large light-rail transit system for size of region (3)

#### **Freight**

- Competitive freight rail network
- International/national freight movement
- Rail and service expands
- The Columbia River gorge provides at-grade water and rail routes through the Cascades; unique for the Pacific Northwest; allows mode choice

#### **Bike/Pedestrian**

- Investments in bike/pedestrian facilities (6)
- Bike lanes/paths (5)
- Strong growth in bike community (6)
- Portland bike friendly city program
- Bike awareness/information (2)
- Portland is pedestrian friendly
- Senior stroll

#### **ENVIRONMENT**

- Linking land use policy with transportation—i.e., station areas
- Environmental quality because of smaller footprint
- Investing in existing land base—e.g., centers and corridor development
- Protection of individual areas along river/ports
- Progressive land use to facilitate/incentives transit, pedestrian, bike
- Air quality (DEQ) has gotten better
- Sustainability
- Recycling rate
- Reducing storm water/sewage run off
- Park systems

#### **EDUCATION/OUTREACH**

- Culture that supports transportation options
- Outdoor culture – people who want to get outside
- Public outreach (can do more)
- Education outreach
- Broad support for “marketing” options for getting around
- Information provided by Portland "transport" blog
- Creative policies to encourage transit use
- Employer incentives for transit use (build on what larger employer doing)
- Chinook book w/ bus tickets is example
- Success stories: Lloyd district mode shirt, OHSU, Swan Island
- Social marketing
- Traffic demand management measures that reduce single-occupancy vehicle use/congestion (2)
- Where resources have been put into marketing have been successful

#### **COORDINATION/COOPERATION**

- Better coordination (bridge replacement, for example) (2)
- Integrating different fields—for example, transportation and public health
- Involvement of stakeholders in move meaningful ways and with more diversity
- More civic involvement/getting public buy-in (2)
- Equity: involve everyone; all communities (3)
- Institutions – TPAC/JPACT/COUNCIL—have worked in past, but less so now

## **Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments**

### **Question 2: What is working well to achieve the outcomes?**

- LIDs – give mechanism for community to make choices
- Increased involvement with freight-business stakeholders
- Community groups/activists supporting alternative modes
- Bi-state cooperation
- Regional consensus for general direction
- Public/private partnerships/collaborations (CTRAN, AMTRAK) (3)

#### **POLICY/DECISION-MAKING**

- Previous policies that constrained parking
- Developing policy to address brown fields
- Policy preserving industrial lands
- Rules and regulations/policies are in place
- Land use and transportation policy to concentrate density and promote mixed use
- Stable policy direction
- MTIP process (2)
- Prioritizing needs—i.e., MAX to Washington Co.; Wilsonville commute rail
- Transportation priorities process/outcomes approach
- Inter-relationship between land-use and transportation
- UGB, compact urban town helps trip distance – saves money and supports centers (4)
- Congressional influence at National level
- UGB, compact urban town helps trip distance – saves money and supports centers (4)
- Efforts to do 2040 land uses

#### **FUNDING**

- Funding programs for volunteer service programs (more money is needed)
- Seeking all available funding opportunities
- Short on money has helped avoid bad decisions/forced hard choices
- Investment in alternatives
- High-capacity transit investment
- System development charges
- Weight-mile tax mechanism/allocates cost to users
- Creative financing – private sector as example – LIDs
- Shortage of money makes us make prioritize and leads to better choices
- Reinvestment inside boundary

#### **OTHER**

- Amtrak – expanded service as a commuter option

## **Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments**

### **Question 3: What are some challenges to achieving the outcomes?**

#### **COMMUNITY SHAPE/FUNCTION**

- Auto dependent developments from 60s and 70s hard to change
- Neighborhoods now designed for cars – not walking
- Rural/suburban communities disconnected from town/city, need to have a car/carpool to access services

#### **Community/cultural attitudes**

- Local resistance to infill development
- Figuring out how to accomplish desired objective over time—how to evolve effectively - it's hard
- Dead weight of tradition; how we define problems/solutions/aspirations
- Culture expects free mobility – pay to correspondence to use
- Regional centers and others
- NIMBYism with regard to density
- Protecting historic communities
- Transitory nature of society impacts community cohesion
- Investing in historic communities with infrastructure and goods and services
- Cultural imperative of individualism (3)
- Our litigations (suing) society
- Traveling more
- Not much carpooling and vanpooling
- Lack of cultural resilience in time of fuel uncertainty
- One size does not fit all, but sometimes that is the outcome
- Solutions don't fit/meet all the needs people have
- People think they are owed projects
- Cultural attitudes; auto-orientation difficult to change (2)
- Auto orientation is learned behavior
- Ethical connections between behavior and environmental impact
- Attitude - education on walking, biking to improve safety
- Overcome attitude of moving max # vehicles vs. max # of people/goods
- Internet boom
- Me first society
- More funding for volunteer service programs
- Dealing with existing system is difficult – communities are not linked adequately by all modes
- Built environment
- Mentality of “status quo”
- People not willing to accept consequences

#### **Housing Affordability**

- Affordability is a big barrier to getting to vibrant communities (2)
- Impacts of gentrification on neighborhoods
- Affordable housing shortage in core city
- Housing ownership – difficult to maintain
- Can't afford to live near where you work
- Urban renewal forced many to move to Vancouver

#### **Jobs/Housing balance**

- Employers must consider housing and community needs and opportunities and help pay for infrastructure
- Jobs/housing imbalance (4)
- Can't get higher paying jobs because lack of affordable transportation
- Attending Western Business College – but living in Kelso

## **Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments**

### **Question 3: What are some challenges to achieving the outcomes?**

#### **Demographics**

- How to keep up with changing demographics – moving target
- Unforeseen cultural changes
- Reaching out to diverse communities is challenging
- Advocating for underrepresented groups
- Overcoming inherent economic and political disadvantages of underrepresented groups
- Changes often occurring in under-represented communities
- Language barrier – 75% of residents speak African dialects
- Not serving low-income families/individuals
- Lack of diversity does not force issues – don't always address this constraint
- Generation gap leads to values that are different
- Increasing prevalence of chronic conditions makes it difficult for some to use alternative modes (diabetes, obesity, etc.)

#### **Growth**

- Number of people and number of cars they drive (3)
- Population growth + 1 m in next 15-20 years (3)
- Cultural imperative to support endless growth
- Growth impacts some communities ability to develop (Wilsonville e.g.); State jurisdictional issues; Regulation
- Growth
- Staying ahead of growth
- Priority / timing of improvement not tied to growth (and coordination)
- Growth in pop does not mean growth in resources; costs out strip revenue
- How broad is public support? Growth is explosive. Lack of concurrency with planning.

#### **TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM/FACILITIES/SERVICE**

- Failure of system – system “brown outs” (congestion)
- Difficult to balance all needs: freight, bikes, auto, transit, pedestrians, etc.
- Lack of shared concept of a “regional transportation system”
- Auto alternates are not always a good alternative; changes could increase usage
- Tri Met/Metro system priorities

#### **Cost**

- Keeping in mind cost of transit expansion
- Current system of defining problems and evaluation of trade offs – info, territoriality
- Escalating fares for transit (2)
- Transportation is a burden on household budgets
- Economy designated to reward driving; driving “seems” cheaper and faster
- Ignorance of the proportionally increasing costs of growth
- True costs of driving not recognized and not entirely borne by user (2)
- No counting of externalities – air/water/pollution/fuel supply
- Expense of living in central city
- More cost-benefit analysis of projects
- Construction costs increase (projects approved), delay may mean not enough money to build (faster-tracked project development needed) (3)
- Families – different for them to rely on transit; cost of transit may be too high and not enough buses go to desired destination
- Desires are greater than resources (2)
- Need different standards for different modes/cost-effectiveness measures



## **Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments**

### **Question 3: What are some challenges to achieving the outcomes?**

#### **Connectivity/Access**

- Lack of connected street network in suburban areas
- Suburban areas lack connectivity; missing links within and to other areas
- Rural/suburban communities disconnected from towns and cities—need to have a car/carpool to access services

#### **Safety**

- Perception of safety of alternative modes (especially for children and seniors)
- Accessibility to bus unsafe; nearest stop is five miles away with no sidewalk
- Safety conflicts between modes
- Parked cars get hit – cut through traffic from I-5
- Speeding – cut through traffic from I-5
- Kids crossing to Ockley Green School
- On/off ramps unsafe because people not stopping
- Killingsworth crossing/speeding cars
- At Michigan/Jessup – 10 accidents unreported, so data shows no accidents (no stop signs and on street parking blocks view)

#### **Operation**

- More HOV lanes
- Using existing infrastructure more efficiently
- ITS (intelligent transportation system)

#### **Freeways/Highways/Roads**

- Not building more roads to meet growth demand
- Congestion on major freight routes is hindering economic health of region; local trips on freeways is a problem (3)
- Lack of understanding about when/when not to add physical capacity (lanes)
- I-5, 224, I-205, Tualatin-Sherwood Rd, I-84 problem areas
- Freeway improvements
- Too much focus on high traffic areas
- Putting in local street connections is difficult
- Existing pattern—disconnected streets
- Implementation of green streets
- Engineering challenges to create “green streets”

#### **Transit**

- Transit can be less convenient to do non-work trips (shopping, medical)
- Transit not convenient enough and disconnected
- More coordination of special transit services
- Bus access to Vancouver – have to leave Portland by 4:30 p.m. and 3 hours to N. Plains w/ connections (often missing connections) – promotes driving
- TriMet now focusing service deployments – frequent service bus corridors
- Having transit centered on downtown Portland
- Mass transit to downtown Portland good, but not radial service from neighborhoods to employment enters (network needed)
- Perceptions that it takes too long to use transit (sometimes reality)
- Where light rail is to go
- No commuter rail to Salem – missing link(s) between communities
- Lack of good transit service in the suburban/somewhat rural areas and between the suburbs (3)
- Light rail lines (so much to do, can't do it all)
- Access and transit service not supportive of times the shift would end (night/swing shift)—for example, higher paying jobs are in suburbs; bus to and from Swan Island ends at 10:30 p.m. (walk 2 miles uphill to get available service)

## **Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments**

### **Question 3: What are some challenges to achieving the outcomes?**

- C-Tran reductions caused many to lose jobs because they no longer had a good way to commute to Portland for jobs; difficult to visit Portland family too
- LIFT service cost prohibitive – get community collectives to take burden off Tri-met
- Investment in transit

#### **Freight**

- Design difficulty of preserving freight capacity from commuters
- Competing uses of same infrastructure (freight rail vs. commuter rail)
- Insufficient consideration for freight mobility
- Airport (at capacity and soon to be too small with population increase (2)
- Lack of truck stops
- Large trucks are always present city streets and freeways
- Business shifting trips to off peak
- Rolling warehouse
- Traded sector v. non-traded sector-confuse & co-mingle

#### **Bike/Pedestrian**

- Promoting walking to school (seniors assisting kids to school)
- Incomplete bike / pedestrian networks; low traffic bike routes don't connect (2)
- Stranger danger perception issues about safety of bike / walk, especially for kids
- Few sidewalks, facilities for pedestrians, bicycles in communities outside of urban areas / westside of Portland (3)

#### **ENVIRONMENT**

- Challenge in creating sustainability for changing community
- Community housing design / older houses has bad air quality health issues due to radon, mold and carbon monoxide
- Lack of understanding about agriculture / forestry land – importance to economy and community livability
- Individual land use decisions (local) need regional land use decision
- Don't fully count for environmental impacts and don't account for all the benefits (oil quality, natural resources, communities benefiting and not)
- Prevailing land-use pattern already built that is not efficient to serve (network / density) (2)
- Connection to our choices and the effects on the environment—for example, that driving contributes to global warming
- Emissions are too high
- Large group of all backgrounds – “precautionary principle” – if you know the freeway creates bad air quality, don't contribute more even though you can't draw a direct connection
- East-side gets most pollution – nitrous oxide levels – significant drop at Peninsula Park because of trees
- Landscaping and pesticide use
- Current land use pattern – where there is low density
- Requirement to maintain 20-year land supply and Goal 14 don't lead to the best transportation decisions
- More solar cars / hybrid
- Public health effects / asthma is from adjacent I-5 (2)
- Making protection and restoration a criteria in awarding transportation funding
- Protecting community from negative impacts

#### **EDUCATION/OUTREACH**

- Need more education about how to use options, such as Travelsmart (2)
- Increase social marketing to encourage people to use car less, walk more, ride bike (2)
- Lack of understanding about transportation by general public; don't see the relevance (4)
- Lack of education about trans. choices

## Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments

### Question 3: What are some challenges to achieving the outcomes?

- Education outreach is limited – needs to reach out to more communities
- Providing information about alternative modes to diverse markets/language barriers
- Don't know when rules are changing (education, signage, enforcement)
- Customer orientation – get political will to exact more
- Earning public trust/confidence to manage, expand system
- Prioritizing uses will be different to gain public acceptance
- Publicize what will not get built (e.g., use congestion as a tool)
- Lack of public understanding of how system connects/works
- Transparency and lack of public understanding – e.g., don't believe funding problem
- How to use transit TIF – current structure difficult
- Time: 20 years to get money to build what is agreed on, but by then consensus has dissolved (2)
- Being able to convince about benefits
- Incentives for change (Prius, etc.)
- Do we now have info about where resources are going?
- Obtaining information from private sector about needs

### COLLABORATION/COOPERATION

- Lack of coherency about transportation system; disparate parts not working together
- Need to work with development community to model outcomes we want (ideal)
- Inter-jurisdictional rivalry (e.g., system grew the Portland center, but isn't designed to grow/evolve more centers that way)
- Challenge of working with private system providers, e.g., rail (2)
- Territoriality – government special interests trumps regional thinking (2)
- Continue coordination, integrated system management
- Silos in transportation and land-use planning
- Competition between neighborhoods and suburbs that want pavement fixed – infrastructure upgrades, cut thru traffic fixed – attention tension
- Competing interests; modal advocates; local jurisdiction/ regional coordination including bi-state
- Institutional development – coordination and communication

### POLICY/DECISION-MAKING

- Length of time to achieve project implementation (e.g. commuter rail)
- Federal process
- Missing state-level transportation agenda
- Too many priorities
- Prioritizing needs getting harder (with less money) (2)
- Federal policy (i.e. lack of high-speed rail on west coast; killing Amtrak)
- Lack of inclusiveness in transportation planning
- Legislature
- Ballot measure 37 – and others eroding support for current policies (3)
- Measures – currently over emphasize SOVs
- UGB experience—actualizing expectations generated through concept plans
- UGB: Limited land supply leads to housing price increases
- State focus is on moving people through areas, not vibrancy within communities
- Projects often try to give something to everyone, which leads to waste
- National/state not focused on options
- Sticking with priorities
- Non-transportation agencies make decisions that impact big picture
- Framework is set by other than public, framework impacts outcome
- No incentive/responsibility to look long term
- Investments that are based on funding category rather than need
- Lack of assistance to new UGB areas
- Once identified, problems take to long to solve

## Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments

### Question 3: What are some challenges to achieving the outcomes?

- Understanding economic effects on business from transportation v. other costs
- Trying to stay focused on BIG regional issues not move local; what is best role for regional government.
- Geographical spread of resources / some equity
- SW PDX giving more, but getting less (get back what is give in terms of taxes—actual and perceived equity)

### FUNDING

- Gas tax – lack of support for increase money
- Economic models (old fashioned); gas tax
- How we currently raise money – reliance on gas tax doesn't mesh with technological changes; economics of using less gas
- Lack of money (9)
- Funding limitations operations vs. capitol
- Restricted and inflexible funding sources
- Too much competition for funding; need more cooperation (2)
- Funding shortage and fact there isn't a shared vision in the state / region on how to spend money region has
- Better accounting of community costs and benefits with our investments
- Funding mechanisms come from auto side (raise money from all users)
- Funding—need better system of priorities
- Need to make decisions based on fiscal realities (2)
- Need to reduce desires or increase money
- Changing spending priorities to focus less on SOV's
- Fragmentation of funding and responsibility
- Apparatus is problem – more money will also create problems – how it's spent
- Financing - how to get development. Finance roads so development can occur
- Get more money to equation and move strategic with money we have
- Better to divide up money equally
- Funding mechanism don't mesh
- Revenue restrictions
- Revenue sources
- PGE rates include maintenance of system – must demonstrate how level of service would be provided “least cost planning”
- Funding – competition between capital and operations and maintenance
- Need to focus money to actually get things built (now money spread thinly) and better achieve broader goals)
- PDX assets – 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 share is good; new assets will come through new money or revising taxing structure
- System development charges do not fully value costs
- Political resistance to allocating capacity – by tolls
- Structural limitations to payroll tax – doesn't scale
- Broaden SDC availability for other projects

### OTHER

- Insufficient research into and implementing engineering solutions (street designs, battery research)
- Location of services—for example, low-income people need to drive out of the area for dentists who accept Oregon Health Plan
- Better batteries – not efficient
- Where does line get drawn when other's choices negatively impact others (live in Vancouver and work in Portland)

## **Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments**

### **Question 4: What are some solutions to achieving the outcomes?**

#### **COMMUNITY SHAPE/FUNCTION**

- Better planning for complete communities – services, transportation, etc.
- Change outcomes to help get to communities we want
- Emphasis on local benefits and how regional goals affect/benefit people’s individual lives and communities
- Better direct access to live, work, play destinations
- Community work groups/students to maintain landscaping on I-5 (nature program)
- Better access to reliable, economical health care (some close clinics, unclean and doctors overworked)
- Promote jobs/housing balance – reduce trips and concentrate trips
- No more school closures
- Improve re-development process; dealing with constraints; “ripeness” – timing
- Explore non-trans solutions for trans problems
- All transportation projects should include public art/design review
- TOD – encourage land use that fosters choices

#### **Housing Affordability**

- More affordable housing in all locations (4)

#### **Planning**

- Plan earlier, concurrently
- Follow through on planning efforts to do something about the issues identified and proposed solutions – in the past this has not happened
- Look at transportation more thoroughly when we do UGB expansions
- Decisions based on better information and more up to date data – CRC study relying on I-5 partnership study – things have changed significantly that aren’t being accounted for
- Long-term solutions (2)
- Prioritize
- Be realistic
- Understand the value of investments
- Build on what’s working
- Institution in place – need to build back up to work as best they can
- BFO process
- RTP approach
- RTP should focus on big issues – e.g., high-capacity transit and highways
- Understand cost impacts on all aspects of life to better define needed improvement
- Better macro-economic analysis of transportation – better data on what drives economy
- Continue to encourage population growth to be channeled toward centers

#### **Community/Cultural Attitudes**

- Reduce driving SOVs through lottery (Brazil) – needs adequate transit
- Reduce SOV through Regional Transportation Options marketing
- Mind set change – attitude shifts – holistic approach (2)
- Need to change how people think about their vehicles/choices
- Stigmas attached to non-car/SOV choices
- More acceptance of alternative modes
- Need education and marketing of alternative modes
- Don’t make it SOV against everything else - focus on system w/ a full range of options
- Solve “regional good” vs “NIMBY” (redefine so discussion is about broader good); enumerate benefits even though individual costs

## **Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments**

### **Question 4: What are some solutions to achieving the outcomes?**

#### **Demographics**

- Spanish speaking drivers in area; training Tri-Meet staff
- Do planning based on needs of disadvantaged communities
- Incorporate "universal design" features into transportation facilities
- Study and understand the equity issues

#### **Growth**

- Get ahead of growth

#### **Mobility/Commuting**

- Make transit work for everyone

#### **Economic Vitality**

- Need a plan that is responsive to business needs and expected growth
- Quantify economic benefits of congestion; compare investments
- Small fixes (that are cheaper) before big projects
- Prioritize and optimize existing system (ITS) maintenance before expand
- Improvements have significant impact on adjacent property values

#### **TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM/FACILITIES/SERVICE**

- Total system management
- Highway design standards
- Design to reduce speeding
- Demand management strategy
- Continue to integrate and improve with preservation projects
- Research and development of innovative transportation systems (broader outlook) (3)
- Universal transportation system (means tested tolling/transit fares, flex car, transit, parking)
- Additional support for alternative modes (2)
- More easy and innovative options for alternative modes, especially to help kids bike, skateboards
- Triple bottom line - increase options, increase walking, sustainable/storm water → favor projects that achieve multiple objectives
- Pilot project that connects outside areas with shuttle service (schedule 3x per day, allow people connect to other trains/shuttle buses-2,000 signatures collected in support of this pilot project)
- RTO agenda – TMAs, carpool promotions, employer programs

#### **Cost**

- Match inputs with outputs – align better
- Make it more challenging to drive—i.e. toll roads – charge for parking
- Addressing maintenance
- More efficiency out of existing system
- Look for cheapest way to solve trans problems
- Understand problems differently – manage what we have
- Assess financing tools, charge real costs
- Allocate capacity we have and reduce growth in demand for SOV trips
- Describe what mode split is needed to be able to live within means
- Use congestion pricing on whole freeway system
- Evaluate social costs in cost/benefit analysis

## **Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments**

### **Question 4: What are some solutions to achieving the outcomes?**

#### **Connectivity/Access**

- Additional connectivity to alleviate trips on freeways – more ways to (better planning) move people/goods
- Better connectivity
- Improving linkages
- Connect communities with multiple modes

#### **Safety**

- Improving safety of biking/walking (higher priority for bike/pedestrian)
- More street lights for safety outside of urban area
- More and better street lighting on Michigan
- Increasing safety to increase ridership
- Increase frequency of transit, especially during peak hours – MAX, buses
- More stops, routes, frequency to underserved areas
- Better crash data collection
- Improve signage

#### **Operations**

- Efficiency and better use of peak capacity
- Congestion pricing
- Access management
- Technology / management of existing resources; demand management—e.g., tolling
- Intelligent transportation systems (ITS)

#### **Freeways/Highways/Roads**

- Separation in high-traffic corridor
- Crossing improvements for low-traffic rout (at arterial)
- All local streets designed to calm traffic before built
- More lanes
- No more lanes on I-5
- More paved local streets
- Traffic/street design changes to make it convenient for cut-through traffic in neighborhood and focus them on arterials
- Cut through traffic in neighborhood to avoid I-5 congestion

#### **Transit**

- Light rail to Vancouver
- Focus on transit connection to jobs should be expanded to focus on other trips/destinations
- More commuter rail, more buses
- Commuter rail (2)
- Expand MAX/Bus system to areas not served (3)
- More bike capacity on MAX
- Improving freight rail
- Subways
- Strong commitment to rail transit
- Consolidate transit in region – Metro takes it
- Clean transit system (example hand sanitizer)
- Make it easier to use alt modes
- Employer incentives (transit pass, financial benefits; no free parking)
- End of trip facilities (secure)
- View plan for transit as a utility

## **Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments**

### **Question 4: What are some solutions to achieving the outcomes?**

#### **Freight**

- Preserve capacity for freight traffic – managing new and existing facilities
- Utilize rail system – freight and goods
- Existing system is under utilized
- Increase reliability of rail

#### **Bike/Pedestrian**

- Bike lanes/sidewalks in communities outside of urban area (unsafe to bike and/or walk)
- Wide sidewalks in bus areas
- Sidewalks to schools non-urban areas
- More sidewalks
- Teach kids to ride bikes in school
- Redevelop policies to be transit/bike/pedestrian supportive
- Increase biking to help air quality which helps reduce health costs
- Bike license fees

#### **ENVIRONMENT**

- Trees along freeway wall will reduce pollution in I-5 corridor
- More redevelopment versus green field – balance all costs
- Oil prices will shift mode choice; lead to alternative fuels
- Sustainability perspective/consideration
- Make sustainability a requirement, but need to take care to not lose federal or state money by going it alone

#### **OUTREACH/EDUCATION**

- More education about transportation choices; shift auto-orientation
- Build understanding of connections between asthma and I-5
- Education on changing travel behavior/less SOV trips
- Education to inform Vancouverites on health issues and why people are opposed to having four lanes go in each direction
- Improving education and outreach of the public for use of transportation (e.g., TriMet and Ride wise; carpool availability)
- Regional education plan
- Public understanding of transportation system contributions awareness to our lives
- Be specific take time to communicate impact
- Stop saying congestion will be solved
- Transportation marketing
- Education (what is good development, what are your options, real safety info) social marketing for land use
- More marketing of travel options for more efficiency & reduce non-essential trips
- Increase awareness of economic effects of a transportation investment
- Tell the public when you what you're doing when you're doing it
- Tell "true story" about what can afford as a region
- Better traveler information
- Better education/information for the public
- Understanding issues/processes and policies
- Motivate people to learn/engage
- Education, public understanding
- Understanding big picture
- Increase trust
- Stop saying we'll grow our way out of problems
- Education of community on how to use what we have
- Beginnings of good networks for all modes and should emphasize marketing over new projects (information that is cost-effective)
- Understanding true costs/benefits



## **Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments**

### **Question 4: What are some solutions to achieving the outcomes?**

#### **COOPERATION/COLLABORATION**

- Public/private partnerships (joint development)
- Consistently engage leadership comes from business and citizens (active)
- Effective use of freight advisory committees
- Improved coordination between different governments/jurisdictions
- National discussions at federal level with group from the region on Hwy Trust Fund
- Solicit more community input (early and use it; better community representation in decision-making)
- Public involvement helps awareness and consensus
- Better communication: inter-agency and intra-agency
  - Projects
  - Management
  - Operations
  - Jurisdiction find best solution – make them work
  - All layers
- Need to bring public along on why more money is needed
- More coordination between Portland Development Commission and transportation goals/planning
- Partner with private interests
- Work with employers to provide incentives for workers on commuting options subsidized by employer and employees
- Expand participation among private employers in commuting options approaches
- Unified responsibility and funding
- “Transport” card to remove barriers between systems – greater coordination
- Look for commonalities of different disciplines
- Sharing resources – coordination

#### **POLICY/DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES**

- Land use – 2040 implementation
- More predictability in land-use planning; look at 20-year supply requirement (4)
- Look at places/data where commute distances have shortened – marketing
- System – take a system perspective and compare benefits across
- ROI system – triple bottom line consideration of investments (2)
- Legislature fix to UGB expansion process – expand where services available or more easily provided
- New performance measures
- Focus priorities (2)
- Rethinking policy for redevelopment
- Faster implementation
- Fast tracking and completing what we start
- Institutional change – relocate responsibility
- Governments should match real world (for example, the travel shed) and responsibility should match that (for example, the Metro MPO body doesn't match its planning authority)
- Redefine sphere of 2040 map and our role in the broader infrastructure system

#### **FUNDING**

- Raise taxes. (Sales tax?) Find new revenue sources (2)
- Higher federal and state gas tax (4)
- Tax employers that don't subsidize TDM programs
- Tolling – express lanes; especially freight as beneficiary
- Tax land use, not improvements
- Tax employers to pay for transit
- Raise vehicle registration fees

## Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments

### Question 4: What are some solutions to achieving the outcomes?

- All jurisdiction adopt street utility fee for maintenance (neighborhoods covered) – might free up other funds
- Make cost to use a mode more tied to regional impacts (positive and negative)
- More flexible funding sources (2)
- Stable revenue and increased funding source
- Diverse and stable funding base (not dependent on one source)
- Assessment of real costs to develop; put cost on developers (SDCs)
- Find new sources of revenue, while spending what we have more effectively
- Make decisions with the pots of money available, not necessarily on need
- The pot of money should be increased to that allocated to centers
- Look at regional level funding mechanism (most funding are locally based)
- Fix funding (new or ...)
- Legislative action on funding issues
- More flexibility in how federal and state funds can be spent
- Other sources of revenue for maintenance
- More creative, new funding alternatives needed (e.g. user fees, tolls....)
- If product result of regular package is shown, then regional effort to raise money okay; however, can't replace other efforts to raise money
- Funding should be based in part on cost impacts
- Raise SDC amount; investment partnerships to return money to investors as part of deal because SDCs not enough
- Include need to provide for walking, biking and transit in SDCs
- Locational considerations tie emphasis of SDC's collected—more sophisticated use of fee
- Equalize TDM program payment
- Regional SDC
- Washington County MSTIP model
- Subsidize industry/employers

#### OTHER

- Socialism
- Change in control of the House
- Correct ownership of facilities

## **Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments**

### **Question 5a: What do you *want* to see for the region's transportation system?**

#### **COMMUNITY SHAPE/FUNCTION**

- Stronger centers w / a greater mix of uses
- Focus development in centers – "lifestyle centers" compete with town centers and undermine them
- Context sensitive solutions – natural and man made
- Focus on mode
- Develop good system in new UGB areas – e.g., Damascus, Sunrise, limited access routes
- Make investments that make all growing areas into bedroom communities

#### **Mobility/Commuting**

- Commutes times 1/2 of what they are today
- Live close to work

#### **Economic Vitality**

- More employment areas in centers (12-hour centers)
- Link regional centers with employment
- Prioritize improvements on corridors of economic activity

#### **Demographics**

- Support for seniors, children and people living with disabilities
- Transportation options for all (including seniors) (3)

#### **TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM/FACILITIES/SERVICE**

- Seamless transportation system (all modes )
- Any new road capacity should include capacity for other modes
- Need to catch up
- Multimodal, connected system (2)
- Corridors preserved for future investments

#### **Operations**

- More ITS for all modes

#### **Cost**

- Keep fares for transit reasonable /affordable
- Flexible based on income
- Consider small fixes before major improvements
- Affordable
- Using capacity we have (roads especially)
- Maintain/ preserve existing systems before adding road capacity – focus on bottlenecks where capacity is added – data currently not set up for bottlenecks

#### **Safety**

- Emergency evacuation plan for region

#### **Connectivity/Access**

- Build connectivity

#### **Highways/roads/lanes**

- New bridge south of Sellwood might be okay
- New I-5 bridge across Columbia
- Share the road – motorists need to respect other modes of travel
- Decrease impervious surfaces
- Address parking issue

## **Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments**

### **Question 5a: What do you *want* to see for the region's transportation system?**

#### **Transit**

- Better transit
- Broader public transit system – more in neighborhoods
- Suburban light rail
- Express and frequent bus services
- MAX express
- Light rail (Forest Grove)
- Streetcar to Lake Oswego
- Streetcar to every town center
- Reliable/frequent service
- Service that works for unpredictable commutes—for example, child care to work/school
- More inter-city travel options – high-speed rail
- Free, ubiquitous transit

#### **Bike/Pedestrian**

- More congestion of pedestrians and bikes
- Walk sign blinking should be extended – not delayed or shorter than auto signal (Killingsworth/Albina)
- Marked crosswalks at corner (mid-block Killingsworth near PCC doesn't function)
- Safe places to bicycle (can't ride – in complex; some bike on sidewalks)
- 80 percent school kids bike/walk to school
- Trails

#### **Freight**

- "SMART" freight system; traveler information
- Greater emphasis on freight mobility for economic output
- Plan for future freight movement
- Network of designated freight corridors
- Reliable at times of day that business (freight) uses; limit spread of AM/PM peak
- Truck stop near airport
- Shift delivery times to evening hours (receiving)

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL**

- Land use focus (to achieve transportation goals/choices)

#### **EDUCATION/OUTREACH**

- Market travel options
- Tri-met should be open to new ideas and do public outreach/listen to people

#### **COOPERATION/COORDINATION**

- Integration of public and private
- Coordinate investments and other programs – technologically, jurisdictionally, etc.
- Continued commitment – to coordination; moving forward together

#### **FUNDING**

- Stable, increased transportation funding
- More success if money-raising effort is regional instead of reinventing wheel at local levels – regional approach
- Creative finance – raise revenue investing in maintenance
- Toll roads/bridges

## **Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments**

### **Question 5a: What do you *want* to see for the region's transportation system?**

#### **POLICY/DECISION-MAKING**

- Build on current policy, keeping foundation and continue to improve it
- Earmarks at federal level

#### **OTHER**

- New measures of success

## **Appendix B: Stakeholder workshops: compilation of comments**

### **Question 5b: What do you *not* want to see for the region's transportation system?**

#### **COMMUNITY SHAPE/FUNCTION**

- Try to build our way out
- Don't focus only on central city (2)
- Don't assume people's choices about living/working
- Uncoordinated investment – people doing their own thing
- Strong divergence from current policy

#### **Community/Cultural Attitudes**

- Intolerance towards users of alternative modes

#### **Economic Vitality**

- Economic opportunities limited by lack of transportation options
- Over-emphasize urban form at expense of economic development

#### **TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM/FACILITIES/SERVICE**

- Don't forget to plan for all modes when building new facilities (2)
- Think about transportation with land-use decisions—e.g., Damascus/Sunrise

#### **Operations**

- No gridlock
- Don't want focus on non-regional issues – green streets/boulevards

#### **Freeways/Highways/Roads**

- No big road projects – that system is built
- No new freeways (3)
- No "Long Island Expressways"

#### **Transit**

- Don't penalize alternative modes user (too many transfers)

#### **Bike/Pedestrian**

- Cyclists/pedestrians being killed
- Cyclists/pedestrians not observing rules (endangers them)

#### **ENVIRONMENT**

- No more environmental distress in poor neighborhoods
- Adverse impacts on urban land use as a result of transportation "improvements"

#### **FUNDING**

- Don't eliminate alternative mode funding
- Don't spend the money all in one place