

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN

IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK TO CITY COUNCIL, **PRINT** YOUR NAME, ADDRESS, AND EMAIL.

NAME (print)

ADDRESS AND ZIP CODE (Optional)

Email (Optional)

TERRY PARKER		parker2012@gmail.com
CHRIS SMITH	PSC Commissioner	

**Moore-Love, Karla**

---

**From:** Terry Parker <parkert2012@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 18, 2018 4:24 PM  
**To:** Council Clerk – Testimony  
**Subject:** Testimony on Nos. 521-525, Transportation System Plan Amendments.

For many years in Communist China, the only cars on the roads were government vehicles. Instead of replicating Communist China, if our city elected and appointed officials are so intent on reducing VMTs, people not driving, and/or reducing car ownership, an example must be set by the mayor, by city commissioners and on down all the way through city government. This MUST include all city bureaucrats - the mayor, city commissioners, bureau heads, city staff etc. - signing a written public pledge document that states they will only utilize alternative transportation and not drive, ride or be chauffeured in a car, SUV, van, taxi, etc. for their own commute and for ANY type of city activities or city business that takes place outside of their primary office space location. This would include public meetings in the community where city officials and/or staff members are holding an open house or making presentations, and where there is usually one of more city cars parked somewhere near the facility where the meeting or event is taking place. The city could then eliminate the entire fleet of city owned cars since using any of them would be disallowed.

The change must be the way city officials get around first!!! Then make sure bicyclists start paying their own way supporting the costs of specialized bicycle infrastructure and public transit becomes more financially self-sustainable so as any loss of transportation dollars revenue due to the public driving less is captured by alternative user fees. If the city government can not set this type of an equitable example, don't expect the public to live in a different manner.

Respectively submitted,

Terry Parker  
Northeast Portland

---

**From:** Thomas Karwaki <karwaki@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 23, 2018 4:55 PM  
**To:** Council Clerk – Testimony  
**Subject:** TSP3 Update Testimony

The University Park Neighborhood Association's board and Land Use & Transportation Committee support the policies articulated in the TSP3. We are very concerned that the improvements made to Lombard be completed and that the North Portland Greenway trail be completed. We are concerned that many of the projects and policies of the Neighborhood Transportation Plans have been eliminated by this TSP3 and urge the City to develop and build an additional pedestrian and emergency vehicle bridge over the RR cut that can survive an earthquake. Doing so will improve the ability to reach St Johns and Cathedral Parks in an emergency.

Thomas Karwaki  
Chair, Land Use & Transportation Committee University Park Neighborhood Association

**Parsons, Susan**

---

**From:** Terry Parker <parkert2012@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 22, 2018 4:08 PM  
**To:** Council Clerk – Testimony  
**Cc:** Planning and Sustainability Commission  
**Subject:** Additional TSP Testimony - Bicycle Technology and Equity Representation

Dear Portland City Council Members,

Yesterday at the end of my testimony at the hearing on the TSP, I was unable to read one of my notes (in part due to a pen that was skipping) taken during the conversation on technology and autonomous vehicles. The thought I wanted to present was a need for technological updated bicycles that would have automatic stopping devices for coming to a complete stop at STOP signs and for people in crosswalks.

I utilize the internet at Hollywood Library several times a week. The intersection at the entrance - NE 41st and Tillamook - is a four way stop with marked crosswalks for two of the crossings. Nine out of ten bicyclists don't stop at all for the intersection even weaving around people in the crosswalks. There is no enforcement and this intersection is not exclusive to the way bicyclists ignore traffic laws. Therefore, if humans on bicycles won't follow the traffic laws, technology needs to do it for them!

And finally one other item I didn't mention this time around. Equity is discriminately absent as it relates to PBOT citizen committees. While there are usually one or more seats at table for all the alternative modes; and while 75 to 80 percent of the trips in Portland are currently made by utilizing a car or truck; most if not all PBOT committees are entirely deficient of specific representation for drivers who through the gas tax, are the primary financial stakeholders for all Transportation System projects. Either by discriminatory design, due to a car hater mindset or otherwise, the people who are directly taxed and pay for the system are left out of the nuts and bolts conversation when it comes to advisory role seats at the table which includes the PSC. This needs to change with motorists having equitable representation that is proportional to the mode split.

Respectfully,

Terry Parker  
Northeast Portland

cc: PSC

**Subject: Testimony to the Portland City Council elated to the Transportation System plan, March 21, 2018**

The Transportation System Plan up for adoption today is a mirror image of the turbulence and upheaval created by the Trump Administration. The car hater mindset in which it was conceived generates bitterness, hostility and aggression between the various transport mode users. You only need to look at the clash over Lincoln Street in Southeast Portland to get a picture of the animosity.

The city has a PBOT self-inflicted congestion problem. Road diets create more congestion which in turn adds to fuel consumption and emissions. Enhanced transit corridor options that take away through travel lanes or add curb extensions will do the same. This TSP will only make the congestion worse causing even more confrontations.

Build more housing, more people move in and come with their cars. With self-driving cars on the horizon and transport options like Lift and Uber already here, universal mass transit service may very well become an expensive dinosaur.

One two-axle transit bus does as much damage to the streets as 1200 cars. One frequent service bus every ten minutes in each direction on the same street would require a traffic volume of 12,000 cars per hour to do the same amount of damage.

Younger generations who traditionally ride bicycles and now want to raise families are transitioning to cars and SUVs.

**Additional motor vehicle capacity is needed, not less!** This must include fixing I-5 at the Rose Quarter, but without tolls.

Instead of sanctioning environmental mafia tactics, extorting motorists and attempting to "dictate" mode choice - possibly even discriminating as it applies to income; the city needs to establish equity by requiring alternative mode users - including freeloading bicyclists - to pay their share for the specific and specialized infrastructure they utilize.

Additionally, if the city expects people to transition from petroleum powered vehicles to electric vehicles, the city needs to require adequate off street parking for all new residential development that includes adjacent electric connectivity for overnight charging. This is far better than running extension cords across sidewalks or down the block to cars stored on the street.

Finally, the political leadership here and elsewhere needs to start talking about the real issue associated with both the creation of congestion and maintaining the sustainability of the planet: that being continued population growth.

The TSP needs some changes that reflects a reality that cars are not going away!

Respectively submitted,

Terry Parker  
Northeast Portland

**Moore-Love, Karla**

---

**From:** Eric Schnell <eric8schnell@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 07, 2018 9:38 PM  
**To:** Council Clerk – Testimony  
**Subject:** TSP3 update testimony

Hello,

Overall, this is a fantastic plan. Thanks for all of your hard work on this.

I have a few specific recommendations, relating to making some of these plans a reality:

Page 2-7:

**Transportation to job centers: Promote and enhance transit to be more convenient than the automobile for people travelling more than three miles to and from Gateway. Enhance regional access to the Central City and access from Portland centers. (CP Policy 9.23)**

I live on the side of Marquam Hill, and can tell you that there is nothing remotely as convenient for Marquam Hill commuters as racing their cars down local residential streets to get to their work and back home. Even with the potential SW Corridor Rail, choices have been made which will drastically reduce its ability to be more convenient than the automobile. It would be great if the city developed a plan to truly implement CP Policy 9.23 as it sounds fantastic. Livability in our neighborhood is plummeting, and although we are located in walking distance to Marquam Hill hospitals, most of the people who have jobs there actually find our neighborhood unlivable due to the commuter traffic... and thus become commuters themselves. Sigh. If this policy could truly be implemented, it would be a self-fulfilling prophecy as employees would want to live close to their work, and actually further reduce car traffic.

Page 4-17

- e. **Traffic Calming.** Traffic calming tools and traffic slowing devices must improve neighborhood safety and livability or if needed to support neighborhood greenway.

This is incredibly necessary in Homestead neighborhood, where commuter car traffic is still out of control on small residential streets. We've asked for more traffic calming, and are consistently told that there not only is no money to do anything, there isn't even money available to study the problem, or even acknowledge it. It would be good to put some language into the plan that also specifies how some of these recommendations could be implemented.

Thanks for the opportunity to submit written testimony.

Best,

Eric Schnell  
4408 SW Hamilton Ter  
Portland 97239

**From:** Jessica Engelman <jeengelman@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 25, 2018 11:48 AM  
**To:** Council Clerk – Testimony  
**Subject:** TSP3 Update Testimony

I would like to submit comments on the TSP Stage 3 Recommended Draft.

As per the Recommended Draft, I support designating NE/SE 20th north of Division as a transit access street. While the street would also make for a convenient north-south bikeway, there is an even more desperate need for north-south transit connectivity in the area. The 1.5 mile gap between the #70 on SE 11th/12th and the #75 on Cesar Chavez is a glaring hole in our transit network, and there simply is not a single other street in that stretch that could possibly suffice in supporting transit movement. While east-west connectivity in Inner SE is quite impressive, at one bus every quarter-to half-mile, north-south connectivity is completely insufficient for fulfilling our mode-share and climate action goals. Neighbor concerns about increased motor vehicle traffic (and thus decreased street safety) as a result of making the street more bus-friendly speak to precisely why we need a more robust bus network to wean Portland residents off their car dependency and improve neighborhood livability.

As per the Recommended Draft, I support the neighborhood collector designation on SE 20th between Division and Hawthorne. The street is currently functioning as a collector, and will continue to do so for many of the same reasons as outlined above. I hope that this higher designation will bring attention to the needs of vulnerable road users along this route, and possible safety and accessibility improvements. Concerns about keeping SE 20th safe and livable for residents apply equally to similar neighborhood streets designated as collectors, such as nearby SE 26th south of Division. We need to come up with a city-wide solution for addressing these concerns, rather than arbitrarily designating or not designating streets that function as neighborhood collectors as such.

As per the Recommended Draft, I support the secondary emergency response designation on SE 20th between Hawthorne and Division. I believe that neighborhood concerns about maintaining traffic calming devices on secondary emergency response routes have been addressed by the updates to the TSP 3. However, these traffic calming devices would be threatened by a major emergency response designation, which I would not support.

Unlike the Recommended Draft, I request the removal of the secondary emergency response designation on SE 26th between Division and Harrison, SE Harrison between 26th and 30th, and 30th between Harrison and Hawthorne. This zig-zag street should be amended to the default minor emergency response designation. The secondary emergency designation is redundant with the secondary emergency response designation on SE 20th. More critically, SE Harrison is a designated major city bikeway, as adopted by City Council on December 21, 2016. The most effective tool for ensuring a comfortable and safe greenway appropriate for all ages and abilities (including the young, old, inexperienced, and people with disabilities) is that of frequent auto diversion. While the secondary emergency route designation is compatible with speed cushions, it does not appear to be compatible with diversion. Permitting the use of semi-diversion (where one lane of motor vehicle traffic is preserved, *legally* allowing the entrance or exit of motor vehicles, but not both, while still *physically* allowing motor vehicle access in either direction, meaning an emergency vehicle could still transverse the diverter in either direction in an emergency, albeit with a slight slowdown at this pinch-point) could address this conflict of interest. However until the acceptable treatments on streets that double as greenways and secondary emergency response routes include semi-diversion, the greenway designation needs to take precedence, especially in this case given the parallel secondary emergency route designation on SE 20th nearby.

As per the Recommended Draft, I support the local service traffic street designation on SE 26th between Division and Harrison, SE Harrison between 26th and 30th, and 30th between Harrison and Hawthorne, for many of the same reasons outlined above.



Unlike the Recommended Draft, I urge you to reinstate the previous mode-share goals of 25% single-occupancy vehicle, 25% transit, 25% bicycle, and 25% everything else. Our recent failures to improve bicycle and transit mode share, and to reduce SOV mode-share, are all the more reason as to why we need these ambitious goals solidified, not diminished. PBOT and TriMet receive constant public backlash from individuals desperate to protect the car-dominant status quo, and they need implicit City Council support when removing on-street parking to implement transit priority lanes, or when constructing diversion to support greenways. If the reason for this weakening of our mode-share goals is insufficient density in the inner-ring neighborhoods and along transit corridors *then address housing zoning, density, and affordability!* Do not weaken Portland's support for active transportation and climate action over our love affair with the single-family zone (and paranoia of buildings over four stories tall). I urge City Council to instead find solutions relating to these housing issues that prevent active transportation from being a convenient option for many Portlanders, particularly those who have economically displaced from the inner neighborhoods. The Residential Infill Project is an example of an innovative solution that is also struggling with push-back from existing homeowners (to the detriment of future homeowners and renters). Support forward-thinking transportation goals, support forward-thinking housing goals.

Unlike the Recommended Draft, I request the mode share goal for carpooling be reduced to 10% or less. Of all the transportation trends across the United States, one thing is clear: carpooling is dying. While simple policy changes such as prioritizing protected bike lanes and transit priority lanes over a second motor vehicle lane or an on-street parking lane, or increasing "frequent service" transit to every 10 minutes from every 15 minutes, could quickly result in rapid bicycle/transit mode share growth (as seen in our Cascadian sister cities of Seattle and Vancouver), carpooling is floundering. This is a matter of data and research not supporting the idea that carpooling can go anywhere but down. Besides, is carpooling really a solution worth fighting for compared to the more climate-, equity-, accessibility-, and health-conscious alternatives of cycling, transit, and telecommuting/working from home?

Thank you for considering my above requests.

Jessica Engelman  
2012 SE 10th Ave  
Portland, OR 97214