



1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
 Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public feedback about the document's front matter and about the document overall

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
As these are policies in the existing Comp Plan, not the recommended ones, I would further clarify whether they will be retained as objectives (more on that later) in the TSP or dropped when the Comp Plan is adopted.	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	All TSP Objectives will be included in the Proposed Draft to include the objectives that will be retained	Email
At the BTA safety is our number one priority. In every chapter of the City of Portland's Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan), and TSP we would like to see a stronger emphasis on Vision Zero. Vision Zero holds the position that no life is worth losing in the name of mobility, and that every crash can and should be avoided. New policy direction in the transportation system plan, with this principle firmly embedded at the core, is critical to reducing serious injuries and fatalities in our neighborhoods. Question for staff, where is Vision Zero spelled out in the TSP and Comp Plan?	Gerik Kransky	Safety is the first goal in the Transportation Chapter (Goal 9.A Safety). There are numerous objectives related to safety in the current (2007 TSP). Vision Zero work is underway at the bureau. Additional policies and objectives related to safety and vision zero will be added to the TSP after this work and as part of a future stage of the TSP update.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Comment: A quick table of contents is needed for the Refinement Plan chapter.	TEG	Yes	Sept. TEG mtg
Comment: Clickable links within the document would be good.	TEG	Links to 2007 TSP are provided on PBOT website	Sept. TEG mtg
Comment: Could you provide a cheat sheet for going through this? How does this relate to the current TSP? The public may want to provide feedback about the original document, too	TEG	Links to 2007 TSP are provided on PBOT website	Sept. TEG mtg
Comment: Expanded commentary is needed for some sections.	TEG	Yes	Sept. TEG mtg

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
Comment: It's difficult to see if the plans (bicycle plan, freight plan) were adopted whole-cloth or piecemeal—it would be nice if there was a way for readers to tell that as there are a lot of advocates who will be interested.	TEG	The Freight Master Plan was incorporated into the TSP in 2007. Appendix B of the Bike Plan for 2030 was created to give specific direction on which recommendations should be incorporated in the TSP - specifically policies, objectives and classifications. A majority of the projects from the bike plan were added to the Major Projects and Citywide Programs list. Just like the Freight and Pedestrian Master Plans; not all components are adopted into the TSP by ordinance.	Sept. TEG mtg
Comment: Make the TSP amendments easy to understand in context of the original TSP.	TEG	The Sections of the Proposed Draft reference the adopted TSP to provide transparency for which parts of the TSP are proposed to be amended	Sept. TEG mtg
Comment: On the cover put “TSP Amendments” not “TSP”, because that is misleading.	TEG	Done	Sept. TEG mtg
Comment: Set up a website saying this is the existing TSP and here is the TSP with the integrated amendments.	TEG	Links to 2007 TSP are provided on PBOT website	Sept. TEG mtg
It is also time that we in very clear and understandable terms, at every point in the TSP document as possible, begin expressing the needs and plans intended to positively accommodate elderly, disabled and special needs people in Portland. As I worked thought the TSP I did not find a cohesive approach dealing with these most vulnerable users. New York City has recently recognized how key this issue is and has instituted a comprehensive program to concentrate on these people-primarily because they represent the highest vulnerability and the highest death and accident rates. We need to find in this TSP update very clear places where the public can see that PBOT cares about these people and is focused on making them safe in the future. Vision Zero is good, but how specifically does it differentiate for disabled and the elderly. I know the care is there, I just don't see the cohesive objectives or planning results that shows the TSP is focused on the disabled, elderly or other special needs groups. A few well-placed meaningful statements (not lip service, of course) could go a long way to at least getting the issues elevated to importance in the plan.	Ray Tanner	Anticipate elevating Objective 11.10.K to a policy to address ADA and accessibility.	Email/ TEG facilitator
It would seem Portland is in a good place to be bolder than I am seeing in the revised plan. Portland's popularity and resultant rising density is an opportunity to really be a model for new transportation and land use management approaches.	Phil Selinger	Noted	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
Missing Entirely an overlay of the SW Urban Trails Routes which have been requested numerous times!	Don Baack	New Trail policies were added to the Comp Plan in Stage 1 (8.50-8.57) of the TSP Update. Some SW urban trails were incorporated into the adopted TSP Pedestrian Classifications, which are not proposed to be amended as part of this phase of the TSP Update. There is a TSP objective on trails being retained from the adopted TSP "6.22.E. Develop a citywide network of pedestrian trails that increases pedestrian access for recreation and transportation purposes and links to schools, parks, transit, and shopping as well as to the regional trail system and adjacent cities."	Email
Promote constructing extended shoulders instead of sidewalks; shoulders are more cost effective and 80% as safe as sidewalks. The bonus is they will actually help us relatively soon.		Policies support context sensitive design. Deleting Objective 11.10.G requiring sidewalks on both sides of the street.	TEG Meeting Notes
The plan needs to be a bit more aspirational; it doesn't need to have all of the answers, but it needs to lay out where we are going.	TEG member	Staff will add more language from presentation and the "story" to the intro	TEG Meeting Notes
The TSP needs to more directly tie into the work of partner agencies. e.g. TriMet, ODOT and Metro on whom the City depends for implementation of much of this plan.	Phil Selinger	Staff will add additional language in the intro. .	Email/ TEG facilitator
The two year Portland Progress was pretty inspirational and maybe a good way to structure the TSP		Good idea for restructuring of the TSP	TEG Meeting Notes
There is little (no?) mention of technological trends and how that might reshape how our City looks at mobility. Garlynn also makes that point in his comments.	Phil Selinger	Policy 9.47 Technology addresses emerging technology. Additional review and analysis regarding these issues could be addressed in the next stage of the TSP update.	Email/ TEG facilitator
While I am not intimate with the TSP (though I should be), the plan seems to underplay the importance of Portland's interface with its neighbors (other counties and cities) and the impact of that constituency on the performance of Portland's transportation system.	Phil Selinger	Regional (RTP) compliance is one focus of Stage 3 of the TSP update and there will be more as part of the next phase.	Email/ TEG facilitator
While probably past the point of being invited for comment, one of the seven outcomes cited in the introduction should address transportation infrastructure accommodation of land use actions and the consequences (and opportunities) of creating neighborhoods that are increasingly diverse, vibrant and dense.	Phil Selinger	Relates to Stage 1 policies and project work.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>We would like to see the Portland Bicycle Plan for 2030 incorporated into the TSP in its entirety. It has been over five years since the plan was written and adopted by Portland City Council, spending that intervening time in a gray area in terms of providing binding policy direction for the city. It is long past time to incorporate this visionary document into our city's guiding policy while redoubling our efforts towards the goal of achieving 25% of people in Portland meeting their daily transportation needs by bicycle in the year 2030. Questions for staff: 1. Is Appendix B of the Portland Bicycle Plan for 2030 the only element incorporated entirely into this TSP and Comp Plan? 2. Does the unincorporated policy in the Modal Plans remain non-binding if it is not included in the final TSP and/or Comp Plan?</p>	Gerik Kransky	<p>Appendix B of the Bike Plan for 2030 are the policies, objectives and classifications created and intended to be incorporated into the TSP. A majority of the projects from the bike plan were added to the Major Projects and Citywide Programs list. Just like the Freight and Pedestrian Master Plans; not all components are adopted into the TSP by ordinance.</p>	<p>Email/ TEG facilitator</p>



1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
 Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public feedback on Section 1: TSP Introduction

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>Introduction, Page 9: Under heading "Regional 2040 Growth Concept", please spell out / define the acronym RUGGOs.</p>	Garlynn Woodsong	Staff made this update, spelling out RUGGOs before it is defined.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>This may not be the right place, but somewhere there should be an explanation about how TSP-related plans, such as the Bicycle Plan for 2030 and the upcoming SWIM (SW in Motion), will be incorporated into the TSP. In addition, the city really needs to have a process that doesn't require years to go by between plan completion and official adoption as part of the TSP. Is a more expeditious process proposed?</p>	Keith Liden	Language added in a pre-amble. See Proposed Draft page 13 "Why is this important?" and "What is in the Proposed Draft?"	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>Spell out RUGGOs</p>	Metro	Staff made this update, spelling out RUGGOs before it is defined.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>RTFP was adopted 6/10/10 (it was amended in 2012) by Ordinance No. 10-1241B</p>	Metro	Updated. See corrections on page 9.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>"The Regional Transportation Functional Plan (2012) contains policies that implement the 2040 Growth Concept. <u>While it is not binding on local jurisdictions, it provides a policy basis for local functional plans that do have binding requirements.</u>" Underlined in incorrect. The RTFP is binding. Refer to Title 6: Compliance Procedures of the RTFP and update the underscored sentence; cities and counties must be in compliance with the RTFP. The RTFP codifies <u>requirements</u> that local plans must comply with to be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan.</p>	Metro	Updated. See corrections on page 9.	Email/ TEG facilitator

The Discussion Draft public comment period was from Oct. 2, 2015 to Nov. 13, 2015.

For more information, please visit: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/63710>

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
Recommend switching order of regional plans in text to RTP, RTFP and UGMFP (and adding Regional Framework Plan – see comment 9)	Metro	Updated. See corrections on page 9.	Email/ TEG facilitator
UGMFP there is an added/unnecessary paren after 2012	Metro	Updated. See corrections on page 9.	Email/ TEG facilitator
UGMFP was last updated in 2014	Metro	Updated. See corrections on page 9.	Email/ TEG facilitator
“The UGMFP addresses the accommodation of regional population and job growth, as well as regional parking management.” Title 2: Regional Parking Policy was repealed. RTFP Title 4: Regional Parking Management took its place.	Metro	Updated. See corrections on page 9.	Email/ TEG facilitator
RTP: First RTP was adopted in 1987, not 2000	Metro	Changed to 1983, instead of 1987 as suggested. Updated from 2000. See corrections on page 9.	Email/ TEG facilitator
RTP: since the Regional Framework Plan is cited, recommend adding in a description of it above, with the other plans, such as “The Regional Framework Plan, adopted in 1997, identifies regional policies to implement the 2040 Growth Concept, preserving access to nature and building great communities for today and the future. The plan was amended in 2005 and 2010, and again in 2014 as part of the adoption of the Climate Smart Strategy.”	Metro	Updated. See addition on page 11.	Email/ TEG facilitator
RTP: since there is now a regional transportation functional plan, delete the bullet referring to the RTP as the functional plan	Metro	Updated. See corrections on page 9.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Seven Outcomes (page 17): It appears this language implements Policy 9.65 (Project and Program Selection Criteria). It seems out-of-place as an introductory page, and perhaps should be an objective? The Seven Outcomes are not explained; I know the TEG spent a long time on this and some of those details should be in this draft.	Marianne Fitzgerald	Paragraph order changed, however Staff determined that the intent of the outcomes includes applying them to all sections of the TSP, therefore staff decided to keep it within the overall introduction section as a way of laying out the framework. Staff believes the specifics are included.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Cost-effectiveness (part of the Seven Outcomes). Neither Goal 9.H nor Policy 9.65 nor any of the glossaries explain what you mean by cost-effectiveness. Does it include the benefits of stormwater management? I haven't reviewed the specific project evaluation scores but this criteria was particularly problematic on large (but much needed) projects in areas that have multiple needed infrastructure improvements in the right-of-way. Please explain what is meant by cost-effective in this draft.	Marianne Fitzgerald	Staff determined that while cost-effectiveness is an important criteria of guidance, it must be determined on an individual project basis given all variants of circumstance. Staff does not have a perfect solution for defining cost-effectiveness across the board, as dynamic tradeoffs exist for all projects.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
Introduction P.3 1st line — 260,000 residents (somewhere I’ve also seen 250,000 used) — you’re clearly talking individuals here rather than the 122,000 or 123,000 new households I see mentioned in other planning documents. Does this reflect a decision to speak about residents rather than households from now on for all Comp Plan purposes?	Linda Nettekoven	Households make a good measurement for land use needs analyses. The Housing Needs Analysis conducted by the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability refers to households and dwelling units, for example, however for Transportation we try to consistently use a measurement of residents to better reflect the measures we use for individual and cumulative patterns and relationships.	Email
1st paragraph refers to “climate pollution” — seems like an inappropriate phrase — is this the same as carbon emissions? Or what does it mean exactly. It’s used a couple pages later as well.	Linda Nettekoven	Agreed. Changed to "carbon emissions". See page 3 for updates. Staff believes any other references have also been updated.	Email
Last par says “transportation system must sustain the City’s economic health ... Doesn’t transportation have a role in enabling economy to grow — sustain seems to support the status quo which to me is less than optimal.	Linda Nettekoven	Added "help grow and". See page 3 for updates.	Email
P.11 Final Par of new text refers to "area-specific policies". Elsewhere there are references to “geographic-specific policies”. Are these the same thing? Or what’s the difference?	Linda Nettekoven	Updated with "geographic" instead of "area". See page 13 of Proposed Draft for updates.	Email
P.17 # 4 of the 7 outcomes ends with "and freight access". Not sure of meaning — is it “efficient movement of freight”??? #7 “global warming pollution” ?? Does this mean carbon emissions? Or?	Linda Nettekoven	Staff determined not to infer additional specificity to allow them to be determined on an individual project basis given all variants of circumstance. Staff does not have a perfect solution for defining these terms across the board, as dynamic tradeoffs exist for all projects.	Email
Introduction, Page 9:Under heading "Regional 2040 Growth Concept", please spell out / define the acronym RUGGOs.	Garlynn Woodsong	Staff made this update, spelling out RUGGOs before it is defined.	Email/ TEG facilitator
This may not be the right place, but somewhere there should be an explanation about how TSP-related plans, such as the Bicycle Plan for 2030 and the upcoming SWIM (SW in Motion), will be incorporated into the TSP. In addition, the city really needs to have a process that doesn’t require years to go by between plan completion and official adoption as part of the TSP. Is a more expeditious process proposed?	Keith Liden	Language added in a pre-amble. See Proposed Draft page 13 "Why is this important?" and "What is in the Proposed Draft?"	Email/ TEG facilitator
Spell out RUGGOs	Metro	Staff made this update, spelling out RUGGOs before it is defined.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
RTFP was adopted 6/10/10 (it was amended in 2012) by Ordinance No. 10-1241B	Metro	Updated. See corrections on page 9.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>“The Regional Transportation Functional Plan (2012) contains policies that implement the 2040 Growth Concept. <u>While it is not binding on local jurisdictions, it provides a policy basis for local functional plans that do have binding requirements.</u>” Underlined in incorrect. The RTFP is binding. Refer to Title 6: Compliance Procedures of the RTFP and update the underscored sentence; cities and counties must be in compliance with the RTFP. The RTFP codifies <u>requirements</u> that local plans must comply with to be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan.</p>	Metro	Updated. See corrections on page 9.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Recommend switching order of regional plans in text to RTP, RTFP and UGMFP (and adding Regional Framework Plan – see comment 9)	Metro	Updated. See corrections on page 9.	Email/ TEG facilitator
UGMFP there is an added/unnecessary paren after 2012	Metro	Updated. See corrections on page 9.	Email/ TEG facilitator



1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public feedback on Section 2: TSP Objectives

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>The Bicycle Transportation Alliance strongly supports Policy 6.13 Traffic Calming D., which will give much needed safety and priority to pedestrians and/or bicycle traffic</p> <p>The changes made to Policy 6.22 Pedestrian Transportation are concerning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Deleted: A. Promote walking as the mode of choice for short trips by giving priority to the completion of the pedestrian network that serves Pedestrian Districts, schools, neighborhood shopping, and parks.Replaced with: Comp Plan Policy 9.16 Design with nature. Promote street alignments and designs that respond to topography and natural features, when feasible, and protect streams, habitat, and native trees. <p>While BTA certainly supports Comp Plan Policy 9.16 as an important element of street design it does not supersede or somehow replace the imperative that we promote walking for short trips by prioritizing completion of pedestrian networks. Both of these policy goals (TSP 6.22 & Comp Plan 9.16) should be included in the final TSP/Comp Plan language.</p>	Gerik Kransky	Former TSP Objective 6.22.A is replaced by Policy 9.16 "Pedestrian transportation. Encourage walking as the most attractive mode of transportation for most short trips, within and to centers, corridors, and major destinations, and as a means of accessing transit."	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>We are concerned with the following changes to Policy 11.10 Street Design and Right-of-Way Improvements:</p> <p>Deleted: G. Include sidewalks on both sides of all new street improvement projects, except where there are severe topographic or natural resource constraints or when consistent with the Pedestrian Design Guide.</p> <p>Policy direction requiring provision of ADA compliant sidewalks on both sides of all new street improvement projects should remain in the final TSP and Comp Plan. Question for staff, where is the ADA sidewalk requirement on new street improvement projects included in the current draft TSP?</p>	Gerik Kransky	The change implements Comp Plan Policy 8.44 and removes a barrier to new residential Street by Street standards that provide more flexibility to match the functions/context of the street and lower costs.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>Section 2: TSP Objectives, Page 3:</p> <p>Concerning: Policy 11.10, Street Design and Right-of-Way Improvements, G: Include sidewalks on both sides of all new street improvement projects, except where there are severe topographic or natural resource constraints or when consistent with the Pedestrian Design Guide.</p> <p>This policy is proposed for strike-out, because it is "inconsistent with new Comp Plan Policy 8.44 to allow flexibility in design to reflect pattern area and contexts."</p> <p>That may be the case. However, I feel that something still needs to be said here to create a goal of pedestrian network completeness. I don't think that Comp Plan Policy 8.44 should be used as an excuse to punt on the whole issue of needing to provide sidewalks.</p>	Garlynn Woodsong	There are multiple "policies" and "objectives" for completing the pedestrian system and providing access...most notably "Policy 9.17 Pedestrian networks. Create more complete networks of pedestrian facilities, and improve the quality of the pedestrian environment." and objectives "6.22. B. Support walking to transit by giving priority to the completion of the pedestrian network.." "6.22. C. Improve the quality of the pedestrian environment by implementing pedestrian design guidelines to ensure that all construction in the right-of-way meets a pedestrian quality standard ...", but also Policies 9.16, 9.18	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>6.23 Objective J - I would suggest connecting Bike-sharing to transit last-mile connections in addition to the uses mentioned.</p>	Chris Smith	Added "and to provide last-mile connections from transit" to the end of 6.23J	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>6.26 Objective F - The Comp Plan has language suggesting consideration of parking for various types of bicycles. I think that variety of types should be reflected here as well.</p>	Chris Smith	Added "for a variety of bicycle types" to the end of 6.26.F	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
Some neighborhoods do not want sidewalks. If there is infill, the several dozen feet of sidewalk is not going to enhance the neighborhood that much.	TEG member	No change. Objective 11.10.G is already proposed for amendment. This is consistent with findings of recent neighborhood street plans (Cully, Division-Midway and Tryon-Stephens) developed with the community to identify where traditional street improvements are needed most versus where there is greater design flexibility.	TEG Meeting Notes
A plan is a plan and doesn't necessarily have to be achievable. Above a certain density, a street should have sidewalks. A transit street should always have sidewalks on both sides.		Street by Street standards were adopted specifically for local-service traffic streets in low-density single family neighborhoods.	TEG Meeting Notes
11.1. E. add Urban Trail Design (to accommodate pedestrians)	Don Baack	Added "Portland Parks and Recreation Trail Design Guidelines" to 6.22.A	Email
6.22.A Pedestrian Transportation change to read "...providing adequate number and quality of crossing opportunities ..."	Don Baack	Add "spacing and quality of" to 6.22.A	Email
11.9.D Change to read "within and between activity"	Don Baack	Added "between" to 11.9.D	Email
Needs minor updates. Had to choose something... Thank you for specifying that increasing traffic on streets of the same classification is an acceptable result of diversion for the benefit of vulnerable road users. We may get our older greenways to work well yet.	Online survey	Yes	Online survey
Complete as is.	Online survey	n/a	Online survey
P. 2 Policy 6.13 Traffic calming (commentary) ... as long as measures are taken to ensure resulting traffic volumes on nearby local streets are "acceptable". Acceptable to whom? This is likely to be a real hot button issue as diverters are added to protect greenway users. There needs to be mention of a standard here or it will be difficult to implement the policy in a fair, transparent manner.	Linda Nettekoven	Council adopted guidance language in the Neighborhood Greenway Report (1000 cars per day, total). That level was selected because it reflects the maximum "ideal" conditions for operation of a streets that should be safe and comfortable to people of all ages and abilities. Should we wish to change that guidance, it will be much simpler to do it in the context of administrative rules or other Council action, than it will be to go and amend adopted policy.	Email

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>P.3 Policy 6.13 D Here in the actual policy there is no reference to an acceptable level of diverted traffic. This represents a change in policy, which may be wise and necessary, but it feels like you're trying to sneak it in. You might also make reference to these changes occurring following appropriate public involvement. F Mention SAFE as well as "comfortable for bikes and peds"?</p>	Linda Nettekoven	This objective was approved by Council in 2010 as part of the adoption of the Portland Bicycle Plan for 2030. See comment above regarding addressing guidance/standards. I believe other parts of TSP address need for public process.	Email
<p>Policy 6.22 Pedestrian Districts — I know City Hall and environs is one, but there's no definition in the Glossary. What is the definition and what is the process for having an area designated as such? And being able to develop a special design district? Who would facilitate this process?</p>	Linda Nettekoven	Pedestrian District is defined within the Pedestrian Classification Descriptions and are designated on the adopted TSP Ped Map. The change to add "Centers and Corridors" was removed from the Proposed Draft.	Email
<p>Policy 6.28 Transportation Educ. Might be good to include the educ component of TDM, e.g., associated with new mixed use buildings and tenants/owners new to neighborhoods</p>	Linda Nettekoven	Staff will consider this as part of the implementation of the TDM program.	Email
<p>Random thought — does PBOT work with the New Portlanders program in ONI, IRCO and others working with new arrivals? And does PBOT work with DMV to give people active transportation info when they get a license?</p>	Linda Nettekoven	Our Smart Trips website has a "welcome page" (http://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/54616) which offers a range of free travel resources and a link to the Smart Trips order form. PBOT worked with New Portlanders at IRCO in the past. That class was cancelled at IRCO, and we haven't worked specifically with them since that time. There are no PBOT-specific active transportation materials from PBOT at the DMV. ODOT has their Oregon Bicycling Manual. Beginning this year we will be passing out SmartTrips order information to new movers through the PBOT Parking Permit process, and also inserting a similar opportunity into welcome packets mailed to new movers when they register to turn on their water through the Water Bureau.	Email

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>The Bicycle Transportation Alliance strongly supports Policy 6.13 Traffic Calming D., which will give much needed safety and priority to pedestrians and/or bicycle traffic</p> <p>The changes made to Policy 6.22 Pedestrian Transportation are concerning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deleted: A. Promote walking as the mode of choice for short trips by giving priority to the completion of the pedestrian network that serves Pedestrian Districts, schools, neighborhood shopping, and parks. Replaced with: Comp Plan Policy 9.16 Design with nature. Promote street alignments and designs that respond to topography and natural features, when feasible, and protect streams, habitat, and native trees. <p>While BTA certainly supports Comp Plan Policy 9.16 as an important element of street design it does not supersede or somehow replace the imperative that we promote walking for short trips by prioritizing completion of pedestrian networks. Both of these policy goals (TSP 6.22 & Comp Plan 9.16) should be included in the final TSP/Comp Plan language.</p>	Gerik Kransky	Former TSP Objective 6.22.A is replaced by Policy 9.16 "Pedestrian transportation. Encourage walking as the most attractive mode of transportation for most short trips, within and to centers, corridors, and major destinations, and as a means of accessing transit."	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>We are concerned with the following changes to Policy 11.10 Street Design and Right-of-Way Improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deleted: G. Include sidewalks on both sides of all new street improvement projects, except where there are severe topographic or natural resource constraints or when consistent with the Pedestrian Design Guide. <p>Policy direction requiring provision of ADA compliant sidewalks on both sides of all new street improvement projects should remain in the final TSP and Comp Plan. Question for staff, where is the ADA sidewalk requirement on new street improvement projects included in the current draft TSP?</p>	Gerik Kransky	The change implements Comp Plan Policy 8.44 and removes a barrier to new residential Street by Street standards that provide more flexibility to match the functions/context of the street and lower costs.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>Section 2: TSP Objectives, Page 3:</p> <p>Concerning: Policy 11.10, Street Design and Right-of-Way Improvements, G: Include sidewalks on both sides of all new street improvement projects, except where there are severe topographic or natural resource constraints or when consistent with the Pedestrian Design Guide.</p> <p>This policy is proposed for strike-out, because it is "inconsistent with new Comp Plan Policy 8.44 to allow flexibility in design to reflect pattern area and contexts."</p> <p>That may be the case. However, I feel that something still needs to be said here to create a goal of pedestrian network completeness. I don't think that Comp Plan Policy 8.44 should be used as an excuse to punt on the whole issue of needing to provide sidewalks.</p>	Garlynn Woodsong	<p>There are multiple "policies" and "objectives" for completing the pedestrian system and providing access...most notably "Policy 9.17 Pedestrian networks. Create more complete networks of pedestrian facilities, and improve the quality of the pedestrian environment." and objectives "6.22. B. Support walking to transit by giving priority to the completion of the pedestrian network." "6.22. C. Improve the quality of the pedestrian environment by implementing pedestrian design guidelines to ensure that all construction in the right-of-way meets a pedestrian quality standard ...", but also Policies 9.16, 9.18</p>	Email/ TEG facilitator



1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public feedback on Section 3: Community Involvement Policies

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>Section 3: Coordination and Involvement Policies, Page 3:</p> <p>The question is posed:</p> <p>Do we need to make sure the coordination policies from Chapter 8 (and/or Chapter 2) are physically located in our document?</p> <p>My answer is: Yes, either that or provide hyperlinks in the electronic version of the document that link directly to the relevant text within an electronic version of the document being cited. (It would not be sufficient to just link to the cited document en masse; the hyperlink would need to be to the specific policy or text being cited.)</p>	Garlynn Woodsong	Added specific sub-section headings where applicable. Staff is glad to provide hyperlinks, unfortunately this step will need to wait until there are finalized document links available, which means staff will revisit this in a future phase of the TSP Update process.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>Policy 6.2: Transportation Education: This should include the objective of providing on-street information that will facilitate exploration of transportation options and encourage the use of the region's multimodal transportation systems. [Pathfinder signage pertaining to transit facilities or walking routes is an obvious example of this.]</p>	<p>Phil Selinger</p>	<p>Staff agrees with signage and wayfinding. Language already exists in the bicycle objectives include a “signage” objective and the pedestrian objectives reference the pedestrian design guidelines. Staff defers to this existing language, which achieves the same intended ends and means.</p> <p>TSP Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 6.22.C (Ped Transportation)- Install bicycle signage along bikeways where needed to define the route and/or direct bicyclists to a destination or other bikeway. • Objective 6.23.C. (Bike Transportation) - Improve the quality of the pedestrian environment by implementing pedestrian design guidelines... • Objective 6.8.D. (Ped Classifications) - Off-Street Paths. Improvements. Use the Pedestrian Design Guide to design Off-Street Paths <p>Pedestrian Design Guidelines – Section D Guidelines for Pathways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section D2.1.f. – Signage. Where a public connector pathway or stair is within a public right-of-way, or easement which follows a vacated right-of-way, standard street signage can be used to help identify the connector, as well as to communicate that the connector is public. 	<p>Email/ TEG facilitator</p>
<p>You might want to keep a slimmed down version of this as objectives to reflect the unique community involvement policies of PBOT. For example, there was no notification to the neighborhood about the installation of the new signal at NW 23rd and Raleigh, which led to a lot of confusion. Christine Leon may be able to suggest some specific language about how non-land use changes are handled (better in the future, we hope). This may be an objective, strategy or operating policy; Christine will know.</p>	<p>Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC</p>	<p>Other than reference to Comp Plan Chapters 2 and 8, the objectives are unique to PBOT. Added Objective S to foster consistency in community engagement approaches and implementation across the Bureau.</p>	<p>Email</p>

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>Policy 6.23 Transportation Education. It seems these objectives will expand on the new Comp Plan 9.63, perhaps that should be stated here in the Commentary.</p>	<p>Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC</p>	<p>No changes are proposed to “Transportation Education” objectives A-G as part of this stage of the TSP update. These objectives are listed for reference at the very end of the Proposed Draft. Go to Chapter V (Reference) on page xxiii. These objectives relate to the new Comp Plan Policy 9.63 and will be grouped with other objectives under the “Finance, Programs and Coordination” policy category (9.61-9.66 of the 2035 Comp Plan).</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>6.2.C. Change to read "Encourage walking by providing route signage including clear wayfinding signs, maps, and by developing education"</p>	<p>Don Baack</p>	<p>Staff agrees with having signage and wayfinding objectives so we took a look to make sure this is incorporated in the TSP and found a few examples. Language already exists in the bicycle objectives include a “signage” objective and the pedestrian objectives reference the pedestrian design guidelines. Staff defers to this existing language, which achieves the same intended ends and means.</p> <p>TSP Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 6.22.C (Ped Transportation)- Install bicycle signage along bikeways where needed to define the route and/or direct bicyclists to a destination or other bikeway. • Objective 6.23.C. (Bike Transportation) - Improve the quality of the pedestrian environment by implementing pedestrian design guidelines... • Objective 6.8.D. (Ped Classifications) - Off-Street Paths. Improvements. Use the Pedestrian Design Guide to design Off-Street Paths <p>Pedestrian Design Guidelines – Section D Guidelines for Pathways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section D2.1.f. – Signage. Where a public connector pathway or stair is within a public right-of-way, or easement which follows a vacated right-of-way, standard street signage can be used to help identify the connector, as well as to communicate that the connector is public. 	<p>Email</p>

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>F. Change the order to read "emphasis on personal safety, health, neighborhood livability and environmental consequences."</p>	<p>Don Baack</p>	<p>No changes are proposed to "Transportation Education" objectives A-G as part of this stage of the TSP update. These objectives are listed for reference at the very end of the Proposed Draft. Go to Chapter V (Reference) on page xxiii. These objectives relate to the new Comp Plan Policy 9.63 and will be grouped with other objectives under the "Finance, Programs and Coordination" policy category (9.61-9.66 of the 2035 Comp Plan).</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>Requires one or more major changes. The TSP does not reflect the concerns of the neighborhoods of Portland who were systematically shut out of providing input into the TSP. More work needs to be done by PBOT to reach out to the neighborhoods and business districts.</p>	<p>Submitted by the University Park Neighborhood Association Board and Land Use Committee - Tom Karwaki UPNA Vice Chair and Land Use Chair</p>	<p>During the Discussion Draft phase of the Stage 2 TSP Update, staff attended 39 public events and spoke to nearly 900 contacts throughout every corner of the city to educate about the update process, contents of the Stage 2 update, and to encourage feedback on the draft. This section of the Stage 3 TSP Update includes reference to the Comp Plan Ch.2, which includes explicit language in Policy 2.1.c about partnerships and coordination with "District coalitions, neighborhood associations, and business district associations as local experts and communication channels for place-based projects."</p>	<p>Online Survey</p>
<p>What is written there is very good. I am concerned about making the TSP any longer or I would advocate including Chapter 2 of the Comp Plan within the TSP. At a minimum there should be hyperlinks to the Ch 2 and Ch 8 and to specific sections when they are used and cited in documenting public involvement efforts. An equally important concern is the need to guarantee consistency (and remedy the lack) in approaches to public involvement across that the entire Bureau regardless of whether an activity is part of the Comprehensive Plan.</p>	<p>Linda Nettekoven</p>	<p>In response, staff added Objective S "Foster consistency in community engagement approaches and implementation across the Bureau of Transportation." This document only has scope over TSP projects and programs. We can add hyperlinks in Stage 3 when the supporting documents are adopted and posted online in final format with URLs.</p>	<p>Email</p>



1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public feedback on Section 4: Bicycle Classification Descriptions and Other Bicycle Objectives

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>Thank you for incorporating all of the recommendations from Appendix B of the Portland Bicycle Plan for 2030 per Council Resolution #36763 as amendments to today's TSP. Question for staff, where are the policy, plan, and project recommendations from Appendix A of the Portland Bicycle Plan incorporated into the TSP or Comp Plan?</p>	Gerik Kransky	PBP for 2030 recommendations on goals and policies and project are proposed in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan Recommended Draft in the "Goals and Policies" Chapters 8 & 9 and "List of Significant Projects". Identified Project have been incorporated either into the TSP Project List or will be within the Bicycle Network Completion, Safe Routes to School, or Neighborhood Greenways TSP Programs.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>Thank you also for including Policy 6.7 Bicycle Classification Descriptions and objectives, this policy framework is essential to the success of our effort to achieve 25% of daily trips in the City of Portland by bicycle.</p>	Gerik Kransky	Thanks.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>The welcome inclusion of Bicycle Districts in Policy 6.7 D should not come at the exclusion of classification guidance for Off Street Paths. In TSP draft commentary it states, "... The PBP recommended eliminating the Off--Street Path classification in favor of classifying non--motorized bikeways based on the function of each route."</p> <p>Questions for staff:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can you please provide the policy language regarding off street trail classification and its location in the TSP and/or Comp Plan? 2. Does the new policy still allow development of trails for transportation use? 3. Are there any geographic locations in the city where trails are prohibited? 	Gerik Kransky	<p>The 2035 Comp Plan Update recommends eight "Trails" policies (Policies 8.50-8.57) and Public Trail Alignments map (Figure 8-2). TSP bicycle classification and pedestrian classification maps identify trails that are part of the citywide bikeway and pedestrian networks, focusing on trails that serve transportation purposes and calling them city bikeways (for bicycle classifications) and walkways and off-street paths (for pedestrian classifications), rather than trails. The detail for which bikeways are considered trails is found in the Portland Bicycle Plan, which refers to classified bikeways that are outside of the roadway as trails.</p> <p>Portland Parks & Recreation identifies three trail types in its Recreational Trail Strategy (2006): regional trails, community connectors and local access trails. In the recreational trail strategy, trails are recognized as providing both transportation and recreational functions. Most of the trails in the Portland Bicycle Plan are shared with pedestrian and other non-motorized users, and are designated as Regional Trails in the Portland Parks & Recreation system, which include both off-street (paved and natural surface) and on-street trails. Trails are typically multi-use, often shared by bicyclists, pedestrians and other non-motorized users, but should provide physical separation of activities when needed and possible. In some instances, off-street trail routes may go through parks, in which case they would be using multi-use park paths for a segment.</p>	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>Regarding the amendment’s adoption of Policy 6.23 we have some concerns regarding Objective A:</p> <p>We suggest replacing the “Form” with the word “Complete” to read “Complete a citywide network of connected bikeways on streets including streets with low traffic speeds and low traffic volumes. Provide the highest degree of separation on busier streets to preserve access to common destinations. Accommodate cyclists of all ages and abilities.”</p> <p>While the new policy provides welcome context on the type of bicycle facilities to pursue, it lacks the word “complete” and should be amended to preserve policy direction to build a complete network of streets that accommodate safe bicycling.</p> <p>The balance of objectives included in this important amendment to the TSP is a fantastic policy framework for improving conditions of bicycling and BTA’s enthusiastic support.</p>	Gerik Kransky	During the development of the Portland Bicycle Plan for 2030, a subcommittee (Policy Working Group) developed the policy language that was adopted by Council. A change could be considered by the PSC. There has been no change to the Proposed Draft.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>Section 4: Bicycle Classifications and Objectives, Page 9:</p> <p>6.23 Objective K states: Maintain Portland's position as a national leader in the evaluation of bicycle improvements and ridership through on-going data collection and monitoring of changes to bicycling infrastructure and in riding behavior.</p> <p>This is good. However, if we're trying to be a national leader in something, shouldn't we aim higher? Should we seek not just measurement, but actual performance?</p> <p>Why don't we have a policy where we commit to being a national leader in the provision of bicycle infrastructure, and attainment of bicycle mode share?</p>	Garlynn Woodsong	6.23 Objective K is just about setting goals for evaluation/measurement. For the more "performance" objective, refer to Section 10: Performance Measures, where we reference the Bicycle Plan for 2030 and its associated mode share goals.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>An overview about how the different elements of the Bicycle Plan for 2030 are incorporated into the TSP would be very helpful.</p>	Keith Liden	PBP for 2030 recommendations on goals and policies and project are proposed in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan Recommended Draft in the "Goals and Policies" Chapters 8 & 9 and "List of Significant Projects". Identified Project have been incorporated either into the TSP Project List or will be within the Bicycle Network Completion, Safe Routes to School, or Neighborhood Greenways TSP Programs.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>I don't understand why on-street parking on local service bikeways "should not" be removed to provide bicycle lanes (p. 5). I can see why this generally would be inappropriate or unnecessary, but it seems very conceivable that this could be appropriate under specific circumstances. Perhaps this could be worded to indicate that on-street parking removal for bike lanes may be considered when other options are not available/feasible.</p>	Keith Liden	<p>The TSP provides guidance for tools to use for specific classifications. While we don't recommend removing on-street parking on Local Service Bikeways (pg. 5, as to where the commenter is referring), we do identify parking removal as tool for Major City Bikeways and City Bikeways (pg. 3). Staff believes that the vehicle counts and speeds on local service bikeways will be as such that parking removal may be unnecessary to provide an adequate biking environment. Each situation should be evaluated individually.</p>	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>I fully agree with 6.23 Objective L (p. 7) to remove barriers. This should include development review practices, lack of inter-bureau coordination, modification of onerous/excessive storm water requirements that inhibit active transportation improvements, etc.</p>	Keith Liden	Noted.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>I also fully support 11.10 Objective T (p. 11) to utilize interim bicycle facility improvements.</p>	Keith Liden	Noted.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>Metro staff supports "D. Bicycle Districts" addition.</p>	Metro	Noted.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>Metro staff supports eliminating off-street paths as a functional classification; this is consistent with the RTP. However, recommend including reference to paths in the description of the other bicycle functional classification. It could be inferred from the current descriptions that paths are not a facility type.</p>	Metro	<p>We previously had a statement in both MCB and CB descriptions that called out pathways. We folded that into language about maintaining separation for bikes and peds "where conditions warrant" in order to bring neighborhood greenways under that separation umbrella. Also, refer to the 2035 Comp Plan Update eight "Trails" policies (Policies 8.50-8.57) and Public Trail Alignments map (Figure 8-2).</p>	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>Off-street paths—we support eliminating them as a functional classification but there should still be some recognition of them in the plan</p>	Oct. TEG meeting	<p>The 2035 Comp Plan Update recommends eight "Trails" policies (Policies 8.50-8.57) and Public Trail Alignments map (Figure 8-2). TSP bicycle classification and pedestrian classification maps identify trails that are part of the citywide bikeway and pedestrian networks, focusing on trails that serve transportation purposes and calling them city bikeways (for bicycle classifications) and walkways and off-street paths (for pedestrian classifications), rather than trails. The detail for which bikeways are considered trails is found in the Portland Bicycle Plan, which refers to classified bikeways that are outside of the roadway as trails.</p>	Oct. TEG meeting notes.

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
How do you define the essential movement of all modes? You should reference your policy and not leave “essential” up to the interpretation of individual engineers.	Oct. TEG meeting	Officers from the city’s bicycle, freight and pedestrian advisory committees met over the course of many months to hammer out final recommended language for these policies. That resulted in incorporation of the idea of performing careful analysis in order to consider the essential movements of all modes. All committees were satisfied with the current language. What is "essential" is and always has been a moving target. LOS A would have been considered necessary to accommodate the essential movement of autos in the 1950s. The intent is to now account for the essential movement of all modes (considering all of a street's classifications). Simply stating "essential" movement as the objective allows the city to more nimbly adapt to best engineering practice on what is considered “essential.”	Oct. TEG meeting notes.
Be cautious about explicitly defining what protected bike lane actually means. Leave yourself flexibility.	Oct. TEG meeting	Noted. There is likely a need to develop guidance about what is a PBL. For example, the MassDOT Separated Bike Lane Planning and Design Guide no longer defines the traditional cycle track as a protected/separated lane. They now refer to it as a "raised bike lane," which is a step down from protected/separated.	Oct. TEG meeting notes.
We would like to see some recognition of Vision Zero in the classifications section.	Oct. TEG meeting	We have integrated safety and the principles on Vision Zero into Section 1: Introduction of the TSP. Safety/Vision Zero principles are strengthened in the draft Street Design Classification descriptions	Oct. TEG meeting notes.
Conflicts on the Central Eastside between bicycles and loading and unloading zones. Sometimes the only way loading can be accomplished is doing so in the middle of the street or bike lanes. Maybe bicycle districts could be used to encourage the city to employ treatments to warn cyclists they are entering a place where trucks parked in lanes should be expected.	Oct. TEG meeting	We are not specifying design treatments within the TSP.	Oct. TEG meeting notes.

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
Anything you want to put in here to encourage expansion of bike share?	Oct. TEG meeting	No change. Bicycle share was on the radar when the policy language was developed as part of the 2030 Portland Bicycle Plan (contained in Appendix B). Objective 6.23.J is already proposed in Section 4 to support bike-sharing programs.	Oct. TEG meeting notes.
Very Complete. It is to be hoped that at some point we could have a similar level of importance for objectives for pedestrians.	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Thanks.	Email
5. General Comment: I think the TSP should state that for safety and comfort reasons on many of our bicycle routes it is desirable to develop ways to split the bicycle mode from the pedestrian mode.	Don Baack	We do have language in "Major City Bikeways" to have separated facilities for bicycles and pedestrians, where conditions warrant and where practical. We could add this to the City Bikeway language and, if necessary, the Off-Street Trails language in the Comp Plan.	Email
Requires one or more major changes. Free auto parking should be eliminated (other than loading zones) or severely restricted in Bicycle Districts.	Online survey	On page 5, it states that "Auto-oriented development should be discouraged in Bicycle Districts." We try to limit specific direction in the TSP since each Bicycle District is different and would be evaluated individually. This might be a comment for the Parking section as well.	Online survey
Existing bikeways are not safe. Roads are in a state of disrepair and sidewalks and warning devices are missing in many places. Also speed limits to cars need to be reduced where major bikeways cross busy streets with no signage or warnings.	Online survey	Noted.	Online survey

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>Bicycle Districts — Although the districts that are proposed in the 2030 Bike Plan seem reasonable, it would be good to develop and spell out a process by which a business district or neighborhood could come forward and ask that their area become Bike District. Conversely, there should be a means to engage the people living and working in a proposed district in developing a district as such. Or is this in the Bicycle Master Plan?</p>	Linda Nettekoven	<p>Bicycle Districts are currently proposed per the PBP for 2030 recommendation. Additional bicycle districts may be designated - as the classification is further defined through implementation - with future planning efforts and updates to TSP. Bicycle Districts are intended to identify areas where there are multiple destinations across multiple roadways in a tightly defined geographic area: in short a main commercial district. The regional government has taken the ideas further, identifying as bicycle districts ("Pedestrian-bicycle districts" as urban centers and station communities). The region defines them as an "areas with a concentration of transit, commercial, cultural, educational, institutional and/or recreational destinations where bicycle travel is intended to be attractive, comfortable and safe." In Portland we created the idea of a bicycle district to acknowledge that in a dense commercial area only some of the streets will carry bicycle classifications (and thus good quality facilities) but that, because of the multiple destinations, all streets in such a district should be bicycle friendly. A bicycle district is not something that would be developed in an exclusively residential neighborhood. It is also not intended as a marketing tool and thus would not be something for which a commercial area could apply.</p>	Email
<p>Currently I work in a small accounting firm in Hollywood district and the building is old and there is no bike parking except for the bike rack in front of the building on Sandy Blvd. There is no shower. Everyone in my office drives except me. Parking is ok because we located in a residential area with lots of single family housing. My coworkers don't see the need to bike or transit. The reason for me to bike is to get exercise and reduce carbon foot print.</p>	Patrick Mok	<p>Noted. Refer to Section 14: Transportation & Parking Demand Management as well as Title 33.266.110 Minimum Required Parking Spaces (https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/53320)</p>	Email
<p>In my humble opinion, We should be focusing on infrastructure. Such as shower, lockers, secure bike parking, better bus services, neighborhood greenways etc. As a result, people like me would have an easier time not commuting by car.</p>	Patrick Mok	<p>Noted. Refer to Section 14: Transportation & Parking Demand Management as well as Title 33.266.110 Minimum Required Parking Spaces (https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/53320)</p>	Email



1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
 Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public feedback on Section 5: Bicycle Classification Maps

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
On Map 6.40.3 -- Northwest District there appears to be a total elimination of any major city bikeway connecting NW Cornell Rd. to the central city. Preserving one of the three routes currently proposed to be downgraded to local access bikeways seems like an important issue of connectivity for a potentially large volume of people riding bikes.	Gerik Kransky	The proposal is for Overton to be downgraded to Local Service Bikeway while Pettygrove one block to the north is upgraded to City Bikeway. Raleigh is similarly proposed to shift one block north to Savier. These changes are proposed because Overton and Raleigh are less well-suited for installation of low-stress bikeways. Staff will evaluate whether another street like Flanders could be upgraded to Major City Bikeway to connect with Cornell Rd.	Email/ TEG facilitator
On Map 6.41.3 -- Southwest District it appears as though SW Barbur Blvd. is identified as a Major City Bikeway. While we at the BTA welcome this policy change, safety improvements are urgently needed on over the Newbury and Vermont Bridges on that route. Without protected bike lanes that particular bikeway is doomed to fail. Please take action with the relevant partner jurisdictions to make Barbur safe immediately.	Gerik Kransky	PBOT is actively working with ODOT to ensure safety improvements are made to Barbur Blvd, especially over the viaducts. The proposed Major City Bikeway classification sets a strong policy context supporting high-quality, safe bicycle facilities.	Email/ TEG facilitator
A handful of recommendations throughout this section are for physically separated bikeways and others are for shared roadway bikeways yet there is no reference to "protected bike lanes." BTA recommends adding a definition for Protected Bike Lanes in Section 11: Glossary of Transportation Terms and including policy guidance incorporating protected bike lanes as stronger form of physically separated bikeways, especially appropriate on major streets.	Gerik Kransky	Much of the language found in this section was adapted from the Portland Bicycle Plan for 2030, which did not include protected bike lanes as a facility type, but given the growing use of this design treatment it would be appropriate to incorporate it. Staff will consider whether to add Protected Bike Lanes to the glossary to better clarify this facility type, and language will be revised. A revision was made	Email/ TEG facilitator

The Discussion Draft public comment period was from Oct. 2, 2015 to Nov. 13, 2015.

For more information, please visit: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/63710>

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>There are a few City Bikeway designations in SW that make no sense (p. 15). I'll bring a mark-up to next week's meeting.</p>	<p>Keith Liden</p>	<p>Staff will respond to these issues when they are received.</p>	<p>Email/ TEG facilitator</p>
<p>Same comment as above (Very Complete. It is to be hoped that at some point we could have a similar level of importance for objectives for pedestrians). Also, in my black and white version of the document, the classifications do not read very well at all. It will be helpful to have a narrative describing the changes in the next version.</p>	<p>Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC</p>	<p>Staff added commentary noting the changes.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>Map 6.41.3 A portion of the Red Electric Trail is shown, but the section from SW Bertha and SW Vermont is wrong and should be included following Vermont, Burlingame Avenue, Burlingame Terrace, Nebraska, Parkhill Drive and then connection across the Newbury Structure on Barbur to Slavin Road to Corbett thence to Gibbs and across the Hooley Pedestrian Bridge. It should also show the route the route the route connecting from Bertha to Taylors Ferry Road and thence to the Willamette Greenway. Both of these routes were included in the Red Electric Trail Plan approved by the City Council in 2007.</p>	<p>Don Baack</p>	<p>The entire Red Electric Trail is shown on this map, but only the portion of it west of Bertha is a Major City Bikeway. The rest of the Red Electric Trail is shown as a City Bikeway.</p>	<p>Email</p>



1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public feedback on Sections 6 & 7: Street Design Classification Descriptions and Maps

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
The TSP, especially in the street classifications sections needs much more emphasis on how the needs of elderly, disabled or others with special needs are served by each of the classified streets given. Specifically I would like to see a simple statement as to what degree of safety pedestrians, the elderly, the disabled and others with special needs will experience if they use a given type of street. Certainly, many of the classified streets are not safe places for these people to walk or ride a bike-but that fact is missing in the classification.	Ray Tanner	Staff agrees that this is important and that there needs to be more on this issue. Stage 3 could include a more thorough review and gather more robust public and stakeholder input.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Also, if we are serious about Vision Zero we need to also demonstrate in each street classification statement how that classified street relates to Vision Zero goals.	Ray Tanner	Vision Zero work is underway. Staff will incorporate this comment into work with their TAC and into future TSP updates.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
Also, simple diagrams would help in understand differences in the classifications.	Ray Tanner	Great suggestion, staff is working on a diagram to address this to be shared with the Planning Commission in upcoming hearings.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Policy 6.11 is apparently the transportation strategy (p. 3). As noted above, I would like the staff to explain how they see this working in practice.	Keith Liden	These objectives are at higher policy level and how it is applied depends case by case. It will require a combination of objectives, classifications, design guidelines, engineering standards to inform decisions about allocation of right-of-way space where space is limited. PBOT continues to seek funding for development of design guidance and a policy framework for decision making.	Email/ TEG facilitator
The draft of Policy 6.11 describes the desirability of having “physically separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities” and in other places “separated facilities”. Is the same design intended, and if not, how would they be different?	Keith Liden	They are intended to be the same, but this could be confusing. Staff removed the word "physically" from the Neighborhood Main Streets objective for consistent usage.	Email/ TEG facilitator
For enhanced greenway corridors (p. 25), the importance of <u>connecting</u> them to form a seamless network should be emphasized. Data suggests that these facilities will be one of the best ways to attract “interested but concerned” cyclists. Attracting this group will be critical for meeting the city’s non-SOV targets.	Keith Liden	Language was revised to emphasize connections and networks in the Proposed Draft. Please refer to page 27 of Section 6.	Email/ TEG facilitator
My suggestion is to add the following text, after “essential movement of all modes”: <u>as defined by the modal classifications.</u>	Lidwien	The officers from the city’s bicycle, freight and pedestrian advisory committees met over the course of many months to hammer out final recommended language for these policies. That resulted in incorporation of the idea of performing careful analysis in order to consider the essential movements of all modes. All committees were satisfied with the current language. Staff defers to the agreed modal committee language.	Email/ TEG facilitator
In addition, the Street Design classification Design Elements for Civic and Community Main Streets, should include parking – to be complete, to be consistent with the Curb Zone language about supporting adjacent land use, to be consistent with the bicycle classification language about compatibility with adjacent land use, and also because parking can be a pedestrian buffer from vehicle traffic.	Lidwien	Parking is just one of many access functions of the curb zone, and is not necessarily preferred over any other access uses of the curb zone. Use of the curb zone for parking should be prioritized depending on land use context and demonstrated need.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
Policy 6.11 Street Design Classification Descriptions: Civic Main Streets and Neighborhood Main Streets: Add: Civic Main Streets shall be managed to avoid encroachments (e.g. publication boxes) and enforce regulations (cafes and trash containers) to assure adequate pedestrian passage and convenient use of the street for pedestrians.	Phil Selinger	Language was revised to reflect the need for a clear pedestrian through zone in addition to furnishing zones and frontage zones.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Policy 6.11 Street Design Classification Descriptions: Civic Corridors - or Neighborhood Corridors: Understanding that these descriptions are aspirational.... should there be mention of how a Civic Corridor such as West Burnside becomes compliant with its description? I guess I am expressing a frustration specific to this dysfunctional street that has limited opportunity to fulfill the needs of the community.	Phil Selinger	Many Civic Corridors currently do not match the desired design, but giving them this classification helps guide future changes to the street. If funding is identified for a streetscape project on W Burnside, the Civic Corridor classification will offer guidance on what to emphasize in the redesign.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Policy 6.11 Street Design Classification Descriptions: Local Streets: This is a very weak description yet this is what many Portland residents experience walking out their front door. Should the street be paved with sidewalks on both sides? Are two full lanes to be provided or is 1 1/2 lanes enough? Is street lighting included? Other amenities?	Phil Selinger	Local streets need to be very context-sensitive, and can incorporate many kinds of design. Many local streets should have sidewalks, but low-volume local streets may be designed to a shared-street standard. In some cases two full lanes may be preferred, but in many cases a "queueing" street may be more appropriate to ensure calm traffic. Street lighting should generally be included, but levels may be lower than on major streets.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Would like to discuss the removal of "lanes" from design descriptions. Providing information on number of lanes, even if flexible (e.g. up to 4 lanes, 2-4 lanes, etc.) provides an image of what the street could look like. Additionally, some streets,	Metro	The Lanes section will be restored throughout, though most were revised to offer typical ranges.	Email/ TEG facilitator
"Width - Civic Corridors (and, Civic Main Streets and Regional Corridors) generally feature a wider right-of-way than Neighborhood Corridors and are able to provide more space for each mode." Is the intent really to provide "more" space for each mode? Consider changing language to "desired space" for each mode.	Metro	This change was incorporated to better clarify the intent.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Would like to see a single statement about the classifications taking account for the elderly and those with disabilities and those riding bikes.	TEG member	Staff agrees that this is important and that there needs to be more on this issue. Stage 3 could include a more thorough review and gather more robust public and stakeholder input.	TEG Meeting Notes
Urban throughways were built in 1960s when cars were king. The interchanges between the car-dominated urban throughways and streets where other modes are supposed to prevail are terrifying.	TEG member	The description was revised to incorporate these concepts and emphasize the need for high-quality multi-modal crossings of limited-access highways.	TEG Meeting Notes

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
A drawing or photo of a street cross section that can serve as examples of different street classifications would be useful	TEG member	The BPS Comp Plan “Urban Design Direction” Report included two photos (p. 25) and some conceptual diagrams of “civic” and “neighborhood” corridors on pages 25-27. Here is the link to the report: https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/541786 Additional visualizations might be produced once design guidance tools/manuals are developed as part of the implementation. Metro is updating the regional Livable Streets Guide which take into account changes to Portland’s street design classifications.	TEG Meeting Notes
Southwest is a bit unique because of the auto-oriented nature. It would be nice for there to be an overlay in the area that gave a higher designation to the side streets on which there are bikeways.	TEG member	It is already possible to overlay the traffic classifications with the bicycle classification to identify where local streets are on the bikeway network.	TEG Meeting Notes
Move more of the bike routes to the side streets and off of the main streets.	TEG member	The Portland Bicycle Plan for 2030 plans for bikeways on both major streets and side streets, to serve a variety of destinations and users.	TEG Meeting Notes
Why so many different classifications? Are they necessary? Or are they only meant for transportation wonks? Can they be simplified for people outside of the wonkery? The language can really be confusing.	TEG member	The number and descriptions of classifications are needed for meeting Metro and State requirements.	TEG Meeting Notes
Changing description “most space for each mode” to “the desired space for each mode”. If one of our modes is unable to be accommodated, a network approach can be implemented—aka one mode will be moved to another street.	TEG member	This change was incorporated to better clarify the intent. Please refer to Civic Main Streets in Section 6 page 5 of the Proposed Draft.	TEG Meeting Notes
We don’t decide to build a bridge depending on where people swim across a river. The classifications seem to be trying to be all things for all modes.	TEG member	Most streets should be built as complete streets serving all modes. The modal classifications and transportation strategy for people movement offer guidance on priorities and trade-offs.	TEG Meeting Notes
Should be an explanation of why there are so many different classifications	TEG member	The introductory language explains the need for these classifications. Need to meet Metro and State requirements.	TEG Meeting Notes

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
The street design descriptions were based on requirements by Metro to match their designations and descriptions. Since you are recommending changes, are they still in conformance with Metro's and/or do they need to be? It will be helpful to clarify in the Commentary section.	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	We are working with Metro during the update of the RTP to determine how our classifications can be consistent.	Email
Glad the Multimodal Intersections are going away.	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Thanks.	Email
Also missing are the greenways for SW Portland. This would include the SW Urban Trails as well as key bicycle greenway routes.	Don Baack	Trails are not always greenways. The 2035 Comp Plan Update recommends a city greenways map (page PG3-32) as well as eight "Trails" policies (Policies 8.50-8.57) and Public Trail Alignments map (Figure 8-2). TSP bicycle classification and pedestrian classification maps identify trails that are part of the citywide bikeway and pedestrian networks.	Email
6.11 J. Good writeup. Add after the 3rd bullet: "Bicycle and pedestrian Routes may be separated even though they generally follow the same corridor" The reasoning is to allow split modes in heavy bicycle traffic areas to make it safer for all users.	Don Baack	Similar language is already included in the classification description.	Email
P 27. L. Should design include specification of at least a continuous sidewalk on one side of the street? Should Shared Street be defined here?	Don Baack	Sidewalk on only one side offers a variation (to streets with sidewalks on both sides) due to feasibility or cost issues. Language was added regarding Shared Street design. Please refer to Proposed Draft Section 6 page 29.	Email
Requires one or more major changes. The plan should prioritize keeping local streets from being used as major arteries; in these cases the city should take action to reduce the flow onto these streets to preserve neighborhood livability. Should Civic and Neighborhood Corridors have unique classifications inside and outside of Centers? Yes.	Online Survey	In general the modal and street design classifications do support keeping more traffic on higher-classification streets, though local streets are needed to provide access to local residences and commercial uses and to keep pressure off major streets for connectivity and circulation purposes.	Online survey
Comment: Classification changes might allow a change in prioritization on one street to harm another mode on another street.	TEG	Tradeoffs are a reality of street design in constrained areas.	Sept. TEG mtg

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
P. 11 Design elements — there is no mention of consideration re: retaining or restoring historic or cultural elements — contractor stamps, etc. Same thing on P. 15, P. 19	Linda Nettekoven	Historic/cultural elements of specific main streets/neighborhoods are often identified as part Streetscape Plans, e.g. Alberta Streetscape Plan, Chinatown 3rd & 4th Ave Streetscape Plan, etc. These features are generally unique to individual areas so it is preferable to determine the historic/cultural elements through specific area/corridor plans. No change.	Email
P. 17 Design elements — is there a definition of a “wide sidewalk”? Does it mean anything greater than 6 feet or is there a sidewalk size scale somewhere else?	Linda Nettekoven	The Pedestrian Design Guide contains sidewalk standards and guidelines. At the policy level, "wide" effectively communicates that sidewalks should be at the upper range of any such guidelines and should not be sacrificed for other demands.	Email
Where is any mention of “shared streets” without sidewalks or streets with modified design standards (“out of the mud”, etc.)? How will these be classified?	Linda Nettekoven	This has been added as a design option for Local Streets. Please refer to the Proposed Draft Section 6 page 29 for the new language.	Email
Section 6 Street Design ...General street classification names are confusing — do we have to have two Civics --Civic Main Streets and Civic Corridors? And then there are Greenways again delineated from Green Sts. in the Glossary, but for the many people who don’t ride bikes, it might be easier to keep them off the greenways if they had “Bike” in their names. Too me the bike classifications are clearer than the street classifications. I know the Glossary clearly defines them, but to the average person, they are confusing.	Linda Nettekoven	While there are several similar classifications, this is what is need to be in compliance with both the Comp Plan and the RTP. "Greenways" and "Green Streets" do not exist in the Street Design Classifications section. Enhanced Greenway Corridors and Greenscape Streets are both Street Design Classifications, and could potentially be confusing. Staff considered changing the names of one or both classifications for clarity, however ultimately determined to include greater information and clarity in the commentary.	Email
P.9 C Indus Roads: What does final line in first par mean? “Adjacent land uses sometimes orient to Indus Rd.” Is this standard transp. vernacular? My concern is that we often seem to designate a road as a freight route and then build affordable housing there or add commercial which then makes people want to make the trucks go away.	Linda Nettekoven	This simply means that industrial properties only sometimes orient toward the main road, but may be oriented away from the main road. This is in contrast to Civic and Neighborhood Corridors and Main Streets, where land uses are expected to be oriented toward the main road.	Email
The street classification maps were not delivered in a format we could really review. The black and white maps made it hard to see what was changing, or what classifications were proposed. We would need to get GIS layers, or color maps that highlight actual changes	BPS	Staff included better maps in the Proposed Draft.	Email



1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public feedback on Section 8: South Waterfront and Water Avenue Area Classification Maps

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
The Central City Bicycle Classifications (p. 12, Map 6.42.3) doesn't show SW 4 th as a city bikeway north of Broadway/I-405. As the continuation of Barbur into the downtown, this makes no sense. Also, this is inconsistent with Map 6.41.3 in Section 5.	Keith Liden	See proposed classification changes in CC2035.	Email/ TEG facilitator
The map also doesn't show SW 20 th in Goose Hollow, which is shown in the map app as a bike improvement on the constrained list.	Keith Liden	See proposed classification changes in CC2035.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Why are there no maps for other portions of the city?	Keith Liden	Map were removed to avoid confusion that changes were already adopted by Council in March 2012 (Ord No. 185208) to amend some street classifications in the "South Waterfront" area and near SE Water Ave in the "Central Eastside" area. (Neither of these areas is within the Southwest District, there were no changes to street classification in SW Portland).	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
It would be nice to use the Commentary to explain what is being changed and why otherwise the maps don't make much sense. For example, what did Ordinance 185208 say?	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Staff included more information in the commentary. Please see Proposed Draft Section 6 page 3 for updates.	Email
Title & contents are not congruent!	Don Baack	Updates were made for the second Discussion Draft.	Email
I cannot find any SW maps. I will request them from Francesca so I can comment in the next week.	Don Baack	Map were removed to avoid confusion that changes were already adopted by Council in March 2012 (Ord No. 185208) to amend some street classifications in the "South Waterfront" area and near SE Water Ave in the "Central Eastside" area. (Neither of these areas is within the Southwest District, there were no changes to street classification in SW Portland).	Email



1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
 Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public Feedback on Section 9: Master Street Plan Descriptions and Maps

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
The street plan maps for SW and Far Southeast should be provided for reference (p. 11).	Keith Liden	Far SE is included; Tryon-Stephens Neighborhood Street Plan - adopted by Council in Nov 2015 - represents the only change to the SW Master Street Plan. Future changes might be considered as part of future planning projects/efforts.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Metro Requirements, p. 7 – Update this section with the relevant parts of the Regional Transportation Functional Plan, where the requirements are listed.	Metro	Section updated. Please see Proposed Draft Section 9 page 7.	Email/ TEG facilitator
This Section is not numbered; shouldn't it be?	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Section 9; first page of the section and in the footer.	Email
Page 25: The last paragraph is both underlined and struck through.	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Updated.	Email

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
Division-Midway Neighborhood Street Plan (2015). In the last sentence, the Resolution number is missing. Has the plan been completed?	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Division-Midway Neighborhood Street Plan is complete and adopted by Resolution # 37157 on Oct. 15. 2015	Email
Page 59: The title for the street plan is in the Commentary but not on the top of Page 59. It's obvious what is being deleted, but a title would clarify that.	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Fixed.	Email
Why is the SW Master Street Plan not included in the document? I have one or two changes to propose. How do I do that? When?	Don Baack	Tryon-Stephens Neighborhood Street Plan - adopted by Council in Nov 2015 - represents the only change to the SW Master Street Plan. Future changes might be considered as part of future planning projects/efforts.	Email
Requires one or more major changes. The South Waterfront plan needs to be fully integrated into a major effort to redesign traffic flow in all across inner SW Pdx, particularly in regards to commuter traffic to OHSU and those cutting across to the 405 interchange; currently this is one of the biggest choke points in the city and the traffic has literally destroyed the historic Lair Hill neighborhood. Planning needs to prioritize neighborhood preservation and stop cars from congesting small residential streets in an attempt to avoid congestion on the larger arteries	Online survey	The South Portland Circulation Plan identified a project to address traffic circulation in South Portland. Refer to the South Portland Corridor Improvements Project (TSP ID 90060)	Online survey
Map of South Waterfront master street plan still shows a ROW through the middle of Caruthers Park - between Gaines/Curry, Bond and Moody. There is no ROW there, it was vacated years ago. TEXT CHANGE SUGGESTIONS: Delete shown ROW (SW Pennoyer) between Gaines/Curry, Front/Moody. Page 19	Portland Parks	ROW through Caruthers Park (SW Pennoyer) has been removed (Section 9, p. 19)	Email



1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
 Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public Feedback on Section 10: Performance Measures

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
BTA strongly supports the formal adoption of the new performance measure regarding mode share, “The City Council has adopted a 70% non--SOV commute mode share target in Portland Plan and Climate Action Plan, and a 25% bicycle mode share target in the Bicycle Plan for 2030.” This is exactly the type of decision--making criteria we need to build a safe, healthy, and climate friendly transportation network in Portland.	Gerik Kransky	Thank you.	Email/ TEG facilitator
We are disappointed to see a mandatory “Level of Service” traffic delay measure included in this section of the draft yet no progress being made on the development of a new Multi--Modal Level of Service. Questions for staff: 1. What is the status of PBOT’s Transportation Growth Management grant-- funded effort to develop a multi modal level of service standard; 2. and are there new efforts afoot to create and implement such a standard? 3. What impact will recently proposed Federal Highway Administration rule changes regarding geometric design of National Highway System routes1 have, if any, on PBOT’s current TSP?	Gerik Kransky	PBOT wants to replace LOS with a multimodal measure. We've determined that the best path forward is for PBOT Development Permitting and Transportation Planning to collaborate to update our basis of counting trips and travel mode associated with development types. New methodology will set a progressive foundation in acknowledging and appropriately assigning development impacts regarding pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and motor vehicle trips and relate them to Level of Service, system-based, and traffic impact analyses. The update, scheduled to occur in 2016, is projected to produce a multimodal traffic impact analysis and mitigation methodology for use in development review. It will occur in coordination with, though outside of, the Transportation System Plan update.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>Section 10 - Performance Measures - I'd like to underscore the note in the commentary about the importance of reducing auto-ownership rates as an outcome. I would encourage policies and measure to drive this.</p>	Chris Smith	<p>An auto ownership target is now included in the Proposed Draft. Please see Objective H on page 3 of Section 10.</p>	<p>Email/ TEG facilitator</p>
<p>I'd like an explanation about traffic capacity analysis and the <u>option</u> to provide multi-modal infrastructure or TDM as mitigation to traffic impacts (pp. 4-5). It's not clear as presented. If we're going to achieve the lofty 70% non-SOV and 25% bicycle mode share targets (p. 3), multi-modal improvements shouldn't be an option – they should be required. The city's current method for evaluating new development is with a Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA). My observation is that this assessment is nothing more than a traditional traffic study with very limited acknowledgement of any other mode besides cars. All the emphasis is placed on auto-related improvements with ped/bike/transit taking a distant second priority.</p>	Keith Liden	<p>PBOT wants to replace LOS with a multimodal measure. We've determined that the best path forward is for PBOT Development Permitting and Transportation Planning to collaborate to update our basis of counting trips and travel mode associated with development types. New methodology will set a progressive foundation in acknowledging and appropriately assigning development impacts regarding pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and motor vehicle trips and relate them to Level of Service, system-based, and traffic impact analyses. The update, scheduled to occur in 2016, is projected to produce a multimodal traffic impact analysis and mitigation methodology for use in development review. It will occur in coordination with, though outside of, the Transportation System Plan update.</p>	<p>Email/ TEG facilitator</p>
<p>Section 10: Performance Measures: This section clearly reads as being unfinished business (which it is). The 70% non-SOV commute mode share target is commendable, but reads as being arbitrary. It needs to be accompanied with some points as to how and why that is attainable. The collaboration the City is now doing with TriMet needs to be referenced here. Transportation Demand Management is a very large bucket. More specifics are needed. This is one place where urgency needs to be expressed. Creative and aggressive strategies are needed.</p>	Phil Selinger	<p>Good comment. On page 2 of the Proposed Draft we added reasons for the 70% non-SOV mode share target. On page 4 we added a reference to the City's collaboration with Tri-Met. The City is modeling the results of comprehensive plan and transportation system plan actions to determine the attainability of the mode share target.</p>	<p>Email/ TEG facilitator</p>

TEG + Public Feedback

	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>Performance Measures (Section 10): this chapter presumably implements Policy 9.48 ("Performance Measures: Establish multimodal performance measures and measures of system completeness to evaluate and monitor the adequacy of transportation services based on performance measures in goals 9.a through 9.1. Use these measures to evaluate overall system performance, inform corridor and area-specific plans and investments, identify project and program needs, evaluate and prioritize investments, and regulate development, institutional campus growth, zone changes, Comprehensive Plan Map amendments and Conditional Uses"). It would be helpful if the Stage 2 draft elaborates what the proposed performance measures will be to implement this policy. Chapter 10 is mostly commentary, and has some good ideas that need more discussion/elaboration. In particular, performance measures need to identify the data that will be used to measure progress, and include a baseline that describes existing conditions. The PSC transmittal letter (Sept. 10, 2015) references the 12 Portland Plan Measures of Success, including "80% of households live in complete neighborhoods (as measured by the Complete Neighborhoods Index)-- I would like to know what data is used to calculate the Complete Neighborhoods Index and how citizens can analyze that data for specific neighborhoods and evaluate progress. Another item in the PSC letter, "70% of people walk, bike, take transit or use other less polluting ways to get to work" is measured by commute trips, and should note that it does not include all trips and explain what data would be used.</p>	<p>Marianne Fitzgerald</p>	<p>The Proposed Draft includes citywide commute mode share, auto ownership, GHG, and VMT targets on page 3 of Section 10. We will provide a more comprehensive explanation of model results in early 2016 after we receive and analyze the data from the Metro model run based on the Planning & Sustainability Commission's July recommendations. The Bureau of Planning & Sustainability is in charge of the Portland Plan Measures of Success.</p>	<p>Email/ TEG facilitator</p>
<p>I'm wondering when we are going to get to see any of the transportation modeling that is supporting the numbers for the performance measures—would love to see a presentation on those number some time.</p>	<p>Oct. TEG mtg</p>	<p>Some of the modeling results are available in the Growth Scenarios report. Staff will provide a more comprehensive explanation of model results in early 2016 after we receive and analyze the data based on the Planning & Sustainability Commission's July 2015 recommendations.</p>	<p>TEG Meeting Notes</p>

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>In the Commentary it would be nice to explain what VMT and GHG are for the reader. And good luck with this; it's very important work that has always gotten pushed off to the future.</p>	<p>Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC</p>	<p>Agree. See page 2, section 10, of the Proposed Draft.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>P.8 Table 2.4 I read but do not understand what is being presented. Point is I have no idea what you are addressing. Suggest an explanation of why it is there, why it is important. Suggest you put in actual car counts on a sample street.</p>	<p>Don Baack</p>	<p>Staff added commentary that Portland will work with Metro, ODOT, and DLCD to determine whether to adopt the Interim Regional Mobility Policy to be in compliance with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. Please see page 4 of Section 10 of the Proposed Draft.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>Requires one or more major changes. Should the City adopt strong policies in order to meet traffic, safety, health, equity, and climate goals and targets? Yes. Should the City consider expanding or replacing "level of service" auto-oriented standards to reflect all modes? Yes.</p>	<p>Online survey</p>	<p>Staff are analyzing the range of investments and policy actions needed to achieve adopted targets.</p>	<p>Online survey</p>
<p>Requires one or more major changes. Mode share targets need some active help, and eliminating both required (for construction) and free-in the- right-of-way parking would be a magic bullet. While PBOT does not control building codes, it certainly controls one of the major parking areas in the city. All over the city. Should the City adopt strong policies in order to meet traffic, safety, health, equity, and climate goals and targets? Yes. Should the City consider expanding or replacing "level of service" auto-oriented standards to reflect all modes? Yes.</p>	<p>Online survey</p>	<p>PBOT is updating parking requirements through the Citywide Parking Strategy.</p>	<p>Online survey</p>

TEG + Public Feedback

Commenter

Staff Response

Comment Source

Looking forward to the LOS alternatives. As a TEG member it would be really helpful to have a look at our performance standards across the past decade — baseline, how we've improved and most important — what seems to have contributed to the changes. The goals seem very necessary but very aspirational.

Linda Nettekoven

In 2015 PBOT initiated a project to identify and track system performance over time. We intend to track the performance on measures in the TSP performance measures section, and will be sharing results via a new "performance dashboard" and other means. We intend to improve data collection, analysis, and incorporating performance data into decision-making.

Email

Section 10 Performance measures: I'm excited that we might be considering modal performance and other items in addition to the usual "Level of Service".

Linda Nettekoven

Thank you.

Email



1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
 Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public Feedback on Section 11: Glossary of Transportation Terms

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
Definition of a Bicycle seems overly technical.	Chris Smith	This is the definition Metro uses in their Regional Active Transportation Plan (although we removed the word "solely" before "propelled by human power" from their definition).	Email/ TEG facilitator
Definition of Bike Share describes the "station" model that is not actually the one we're pursuing!	Chris Smith	Language updated. Please refer to the Proposed Draft Section 11 page 7.	Email/ TEG facilitator
We are not treating all Centers equally. We removed the definition of "Central City" in favor of lumping under "Centers" but have not done the same for "Regional Centers" or "Town Centers"	Chris Smith	Updated. Now all Centers are found in the glossary under the Centers heading.	Email/ TEG facilitator
We have a definition for High Capacity Transit, should we add one for "Frequent Service" transit?	Chris Smith	Added. Please see Proposed Draft Section 11 page 15.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Should we add a definition for "Protected Bikeways"?	Chris Smith	Added "Protected Bike Lane" on Proposed Draft Section 11 page 27.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Not sure definition of Streetcar should include "mixed-traffic". I expect we'll see portion of the Streetcar system become exclusive right-of-way over the next 20 years.	Chris Smith	Definition updated. Please see Proposed Draft Section 11 page 31.	Email/ TEG facilitator

The Discussion Draft public comment period was from Oct. 2, 2015 to Nov. 13, 2015.

For more information, please visit: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/63710>

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
Metro – delete “2000” from description; dates to document.	Metro	Done. Please see Proposed Draft Section 11 page 19.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Peak Period- there is a typo – “the” is missing a “t”	Metro	Thank you. Update can be found on Proposed Draft Section 11 page 25.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>Curb Zone. The glossary defines this as "the area of public right-of-way next to the curb." What about all of the ROW that does not have a curb? Management of the full right of way needs to include all of the public uses of the right of way, including stormwater management (i.e. ditches and swales) and shoulders. If it's specific to parking, there have been many issues where vehicles parked on shoulders force people to walk in the street (which is very unsafe). This topic may need more discussion.</p>	Marianne Fitzgerald	Updated description can be found in the Proposed Draft in Section 11 page 13.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>In general, terms here should mirror terms in the Comp Plan glossary or explain the nuanced difference. For example, the term “Access” is very different in the two documents. Other terms: City Greenway – should this say City Greenways since the definition references a “system” of streets and trails to be consistent with the Comp Plan. “Corridor” is very different in the two documents. “Curb Zone” should probably be in the Comp Plan since I think it’s used there</p>	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Language is now more consistent with Comp Plan glossary definitions.	Email
<p>The Comp Plan uses the term, “Neighborhoods” and the TSP uses “Neighborhood”; while I know the difference, it can be confusing to the typical reader. Perhaps some clarification is needed.</p>	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Staff reviewed the Comp Plan and see that it uses the plural, however the word is more frequently used in the singular in the TSP so staff decided to keep it singular for consistency in the TSP itself.	Email
<p>Page 37: “Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP)” is not in the correct location alphabetically speaking</p>	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Updated. Please see Proposed Draft Section 11 page 29.	Email

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
4. change to "...prioritized for bicycles and or enhances for pedestrians." Some of the SW Urban Trails are not suitable for bicycles.	Don Baack	Enhanced Greenways as defined in Chapter 3 are enhanced for pedestrians. No change.	Email
P 9. City Greenway 4. change to "...extensive network of streets, or trails with low volumes...."	Don Baack	Staff decided not to make this change in order to keep it consistent with the Comp Plan glossary. Both Chapter 3 of the Comp Plan and the Greenways Report do not mention trails.	Email
Early Bird Parking - Consider the times for early bird parking to help control AM traffic. Probably does not fit here.	Don Baack	Good idea. Staff passed your comments on to Parking Operations staff to consider during the implementation phase of the Central City Parking Policy Updates.	Email
P 23 Nhood Corridor change to "...extensive network of streets, or trails with low volumes...."	Don Baack	Staff considered this change, however determined instead to keep the definition consistent with the Comp Plan Glossary and Chapter 3 of the Comp Plan (see Policy 3.54, Neighborhood Corridors).	Email
P 31 Traffic Calming change to "...calming strategies provide speed bumps, curb extensions, planted median strips, chicanes, roundabouts, narrowed travel lanes and other generally accepted methods to slow traffic."	Don Baack	No change at this time. Current definition includes general PBOT tools.	Email
Add definition of chichane.	Don Baack	Not currently using this term.	Email
Trails. change to "...Trails may be located along streams, through natural areas, along railroad rights of way, along streets, on streets, on easements on private property and on unbuilt rights of way".	Don Baack	Review as part of Pedestrian Master Plan and Trails update.	Email
Comment: No definition of "busy" streets but the term is used a lot.	TEG	No change at this time. Street fee discussion is in the past. Will determine if other sections of PBOT are using this and propose change if needed.	Sept. TEG mtg
A handful of recommendations throughout this section are for physically separated bikeways and others are for shared roadway bikeways yet there is no reference to "protected bike lanes." BTA recommends adding a definition for Protected Bike Lanes in Section 11: Glossary of Transportation Terms and including policy guidance incorporating protected bike lanes as stronger form of physically separated bikeways, especially appropriate on major streets.	Gerik Kransky	Added. Please see page 27 of Section 11 from December 18 draft.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>I believe that water transit needs to be included in this plan. Portland has a long history of water transit and two large rivers that provide available right-of-way. Water transit will not solve all the transportation issues facing the City of Portland, but it can be a valuable piece of the transit options puzzle. Water transit to/from Vancouver, Lake Oswego and even Oregon City is possible today with current technology. Clackamas County already operates ferries on the Willamette and has ferry linking to Portland in their transit plans. They are just waiting for Portland to catch up to them on the planning front. There are over 600 ferry operations in the United States and more every year as technology improves opening more opportunities. In San Francisco, Red and White Fleet was recently awarded a \$500,000 grant from MARAD to study the viability of the United States first high speed Hydrogen Fuel Cell Ferry. This concept-ferry would have zero emissions and travel over 30 knots carrying over 150 people, all in a low wake hull design. Portland has the shipyards to build and maintain a fleet of ferries and a solid marine community to operate them. I know there has been misinformation about it being impossible to build water infrastructure on the Willamette River due to various laws and regulations. This is not true as both the Portland Spirit and SK Northwest have constructed docks in the last two years with SK Northwest's dock being installed in October of 2015. The City of Portland Transportation Bureau has never had anyone attend any of the national ferry conferences, even the annual one in Seattle, WA. It has no expertise to make an intelligent decision on the viability of ferries on the Willamette and Columbia River systems. There are over 9,000 commercial vessels carrying about 300 million people annually, surely the opportunity is worth investing some time and energy. Portland has about 10 vessels carrying about 200,000 people annually. The Willamette River is already designated part of the National Marine Highway system and is eligible for funds to promote water transit remove traffic from I-5. Changes to the TSP include: In Chapter 11, under definitions include the following:</p> <p>Ferry—water transportation, both passenger only and vehicle/passenger versions.</p> <p>High Capacity Transit...add Ferry to the definition</p>	<p>From Dan Yates, President of Portland Spirit Cruises</p>	<p>Addressing water travel identified in the CC Plans.</p>	<p>Email</p>



1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public Feedback on Section 12: Refinement Plans and Studies

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
Section 12: Refinement Plans and Studies, Page 3: I would like to suggest that a new study be added to this section: CORDON PRICING Study the implementation of a cordon pricing system within Central Portland. While the scope of the study would include the effectiveness of drawing various different boundaries, one boundary studied should include from I-205 to Skyline Blvd, Columbia River south to the southern City limits. Due to federal regulations, the interstates themselves would not be tolled, but vehicles would be tolled upon exiting the interstates to enter the cordon area. The study scope would include: - Boundaries - Pricing level - Payment collection strategies - Projected impacts on VMT, GHG, congestion, transit loads, mode share, etc. - Possible use of funds, including mitigating impacts	Garlynn Woodsong	Added. See page 79 of Section 12.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>Section 12: Refinement Plans and Studies, Page 17:</p> <p>Any study of new North Willamette River Crossings should also include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A new pedestrian/bicycle bridge across the Willamette at its mouth, from Kelley Point to Sauvie Island - Adding a pedestrian/bicycle path to the North Portland Railroad Bridge, similar to the one added to the Steel Bridge. - Whether a new bridge for cars / freight would be needed at all if a Cordon Pricing strategy were adopted. 	Garlynn Woodsong	Added. See page 23 of Section 12.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>Section 12: Refinement Plans and Studies, Page 37:</p> <p>I'm not positive that the Oregon Passenger Rail Project was conducted with the best interests of Portland and its hinterlands in mind. It may be worthwhile to spend more time considering how well-designed, medium-to-high-speed electrified commuter / inter-city rail could be use to reduce VMT & GHG, aid mode-share goals, boost economic development, and grow the economy, especially within station areas. Whether the Tualatin/Portland Commuter Rail Extension Study is the right vehicle for this investigation, or whether the scope should be changed is certainly a valid discussion topic.</p>	Garlynn Woodsong	No change. Need additional analysis.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>Section 12: Refinement Plans and Studies, Page 41:</p> <p>I-84/I-205/Tillamook Multi Use Connector Study</p> <p>This study should not be deleted, as the Phase II of the Sullivan Gulch Trail / Concept Plan, covering the area east of I-205 to 122nd Ave, was never completed. This study needs to be completed, so this phase of the project can move into final design, engineering, and funding phases.</p>	Garlynn Woodsong	Other section of the trail is in the project list. If project list project not complete; can propose changes to the study at PSC.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>Southwest Corridor should include a reference to the Barbur Concept Plan.</p>	Chris Smith	Added. See page 29 of Section 12.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
I'd love to see the West Portland/I-5 Access item make reference to the land use potential that could be unlocked by relocating the I-5 ramps at Capitol Highway.	Chris Smith	Added. See page 37 of Section 12.	Email/ TEG facilitator
The Hwy 99E – Portland Central City to Milwaukie corridor (p. 17) has significant ped/bike issues as well. This refinement plan should include a robust active transportation component.	Keith Liden	Added. See page 17 of Section 12.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Similar to above the Interstate 205 project (p. 19) should have a ped/bike component, especially relating to crossing I-205 and gaining access to transit.	Keith Liden	Added. See page 19 of Section 12.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Same comment for I-205 Ramp Study (p. 35).	Keith Liden	No change. Needs additional analysis.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Interjurisdictional Arterial Improvements Coordination (p. 63) is an important project to pursue. However, similar to above, the project as described is too auto-centric. Issues pertaining to active transportation should be included. For example, Beaverton-Hillsdale Hwy. has buffered bike lanes and sidewalks up to the western city limits. But at the city limit line it becomes a nightmare for cyclists even though there are two good routes within a couple blocks (Scholls Ferry and Oleson).	Keith Liden	Added. See page 63 of Section 12.	Email/ TEG facilitator
The underlying theme for the majority of the plans/projects revolves around making it better to drive. The city should be sponsoring more work like the Central City Pedestrian Enhancements Study and Multi-modal Safety projects (p. 41).	Keith Liden	Added. See page 41 of Section 12.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Section 12: Refinement Plans and Studies: As discussed at the September TEG meeting this section falls short of being useful to the reader. I don't know the official status of these studies, but some expanded explanation and context would seem appropriate. The Powell/Foster and Barbur references should include the Metro/TriMet-led transit corridor studies. The Lake Oswego to Portland Transit and Transit Study should not be allowed to simply drop out of the TSP, but some outlook for reinventing this process would seem appropriate and in keeping with the ambitious modes shift target of the TSP. I'd like to see more explanation as to how studies drop out of the TSP - whether by virtue of completion or the process faltering.	Phil Selinger	A table with deleted, current and future studies with updates will be added as an appendix for the next version. See commentary page 2; Section 12.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
These need to be consistent with what is in the RTP. Some of the refinement plans/studies being deleted are in the RTP, such as Lake Oswego to Portland Trail Study and I-5 North from I- 84 to Clark County	Metro	Further analysis is needed with Metro staff. Additional changes as needed will be proposed to PSC in briefings and hearings. If needed.	Email/ TEG facilitator
I-84/Banfield Trail (Sullivan’s Gulch) - was Phase II completed and isn’t a master plan still needed? There are many feasibility elements that were not included in the concept plan	Metro	No change. The Sullivan’s Gulch Trail Concept Plan adopted in 2012 covered the Willamette River to I-205.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Many of these studies focused on making many of the areas better for motorists; the focus should be elsewhere.	Oct. TEG meeting	More analysis and refinement of studies will be done in the next stage of the TSP update.	Oct. TEG meeting
The regional transit studies at Metro and Trimet should be more directly referenced here. There should be references to plans that were completed; they shouldn’t just disappear.	Oct. TEG meeting	A table with deleted, current and future studies with updates will be added as an appendix for the next version. See commentary page 2; Section 12.	Oct. TEG meeting
There was an I-5/I-405 loop study but it’s no longer in there. It would be nice to know what happened to it.	Oct. TEG meeting	A table with deleted, current and future studies with updates will be added as an appendix for the next version. See commentary page 2; Section 12.	Oct. TEG meeting
Page 3: The last paragraph is partially both underlined and struck through.	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Thank you, updated.	Email
Page 7: Just a reminder that in the last sentence descriptions that are called for are missing (I assume you know that).	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Thank you, updated.	Email
Page 15: Last sentence – freight should be capitalized if the other modes are (or not?)	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Thank you, updated.	Email
Page 37: Should the titles of the studies be struck through since the rest of the descriptions are being deleted?]]	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Thank you, updated.	Email

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
Page 41: Same comment as above.	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Thank you, updated.	Email
Page 43: Same comment as above for the Union Station Multi Modal Center Study.	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Thank you, updated.	Email
Page 47: Should the time frames be updated for the two studies on this page?	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Yes, thank you, updated.	Email
Page 49: Same comment as above.	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Thank you, updated.	Email
Page 63: The last paragraph has some formatting and spelling mistakes.	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Thank you, updated.	Email
Page 69: Same comment as above under Citywide All-Modes Needs Analysis.	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Thank you, updated.	Email
I understand this section to mean future studies. I would appreciate a simple chart that lists the plans, with a status or potential date the plan might be undertaken. In some cases, the plan would have several sections, some completed, some in process and some future.	Don Baack	A table with deleted, current and future studies with updates will be added as an appendix for the next version. See commentary page 2; Section 12.	email
P 25 Last bullet. change to "...Barbur Boulevard Streetscape Plan, SWTrails Plan, Pedestrian Master Plan, 2030 Bicycle Master Plan and Barbur ..."	Don Baack	Thank you, updated.	Email

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>P 39 There continues to be work done to bring forward a plan for a bicycle & pedestrian trail to Lake Oswego starting at the Selwood Bridge. It should be included in this document.</p>	Don Baack	Trail is still on the project list. Additional analysis can be done as part of a future pedestrian master plan update.	Email
<p>P 69. SW In Motion. Change to "...//buctcke Okab fir 2030, SW Urban Trails Plan, The Red electric Plan, the Barbur Concept ..."</p>	Don Baack	No change. Typo. Will add in next draft.	Email
<p>River Based Transit. I'm not sure where this belongs, but I'm not seeing any reference to water based transportation such as water taxis on the Willamette. I've sat through at least two presentations on possible routes, required population growth to make such routes feasible, etc. It was also mentioned during the SE Quadrant Study. If we're thinking 25 years out, shouldn't we be studying this possibility?</p>	Linda Nettekoven	Central City Plan/s will have more about river/water and then will be incorporated.	Email

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>I believe that water transit needs to be included in this plan. Portland has a long history of water transit and two large rivers that provide available right-of-way. Water transit will not solve all the transportation issues facing the City of Portland, but it can be a valuable piece of the transit options puzzle. Water transit to/from Vancouver, Lake Oswego and even Oregon City is possible today with current technology. Clackamas County already operates ferries on the Willamette and has ferry linking to Portland in their transit plans. They are just waiting for Portland to catch up to them on the planning front. There are over 600 ferry operations in the United States and more every year as technology improves opening more opportunities. In San Francisco, Red and White Fleet was recently awarded a \$500,000 grant from MARAD to study the viability of the United States first high speed Hydrogen Fuel Cell Ferry. This concept-ferry would have zero emissions and travel over 30 knots carrying over 150 people, all in a low wake hull design. Portland has the shipyards to build and maintain a fleet of ferries and a solid marine community to operate them. I know there has been misinformation about it being impossible to build water infrastructure on the Willamette River due to various laws and regulations. This is not true as both the Portland Spirit and SK Northwest have constructed docks in the last two years with SK Northwest's dock being installed in October of 2015. The City of Portland Transportation Bureau has never had anyone attend any of the national ferry conferences, even the annual one in Seattle, WA. It has no expertise to make an intelligent decision on the viability of ferries on the Willamette and Columbia River systems. There are over 9,000 commercial vessels carrying about 300 million people annually, surely the opportunity is worth investing some time and energy. Portland has about 10 vessels carrying about 200,000 people annually. The Willamette River is already designated part of the National Marine Highway system and is eligible for funds to promote water transit remove traffic from I-5. Changes to the TSP include: In Chapter 10, in Task 5 for mode share, include water transit/ferry as part of the solution to reduce SOV.</p>	<p>From Dan Yates, President of Portland Spirit Cruises</p>	<p>Central City Plan/s will have more about river/water and then will be incorporated.</p>	<p>Email</p>



1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public Feedback on Section 13: Area Studies

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
Section 13: Area Studies: Consider keeping a list of the area studies in the TSP at least as a reference and context for readers. Web links could be provided with each listing.	Phil Selinger	Will do in next Stage of TSP update and with project tracking process.	Email/ TEG facilitator
P 3. Oversight. Even though it is being deleted, the SW Urban Trails Plan should be listed as being deleted, and someone should be sure it is put on the city web site.	Don Baack	Will do in next Stage of TSP update and with project tracking process.	Email
Please don't delete this chapter without creating a complete and continually updated master list of studies (area as well as modal). Even if they are all on the web, a person needs to know what exists in order to go looking for one, so a link to a master list is important.	Linda Nettekoven	Will do in next Stage of TSP update and with project tracking process. List will stay in the document until the next version and fully updated TSP is available.	Email



1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public Feedback on Section 14: TDM Objectives and Code

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
Service Delivery: This is a hard question to answer. Ideally, the option with the lowest overhead cost would be chosen, and that information isn't easily available.	Garlynn Woodsong	We intend to discuss TDM service delivery options in more detail with stakeholders in 2016.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Fees: TDM shouldn't necessarily be a financial burden on new development, especially new development that is trying to do the right thing (i.e. provide little or no auto parking, plentiful bicycle parking, in a transit-rich location, in a green building, etc.). Therefore, it would make sense to charge as little as possible up-front, and make later fees negotiable based on the merits of the individual project relative to objective standards. That is, understanding that much development is on spec and does not produce revenue until it is leased out or sold off, and fully occupied, as many costs as possible should be deferred and made payable out of income generated by the operating development, rather than loaded as an up-front cost on the spec developer.	Garlynn Woodsong	Good points. We are evaluating the up front and ongoing options, as well as a mix of the two.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>Pre-Approved TDM Plan content: This is critical. Many developers will not be experts in TDM. To the degree that the City can provide guidance, and the option to select from a menu of options, this would be vastly preferable to making the developer propose the TDM package. If a developer has TDM expertise and wishes to propose an alternative TDM package, on the other hand, there should be a fairly simple pathway to do so, one that does not include excessive additional fees or review times.</p>	Garlynn Woodsong	Thank you; this option is referenced in the Proposed Draft.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>Auto Ownership Target: Yes, a new auto ownership target should be established, one that provides flexibility for individual residents to be free to choose to own multiple automobiles, if they have the ability to pay the additional related costs, and yet ensures a clear pathway to attaining citywide community goals. The proposed unbundling of parking, combined with parking maximums, and clear regulation & pricing of on-street parking, would seem to provide some good levers towards attaining this goal.</p>	Garlynn Woodsong	Thank you; we agree.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>Section 14: Transportation Demand Management: I suspect folks often tune out when TDM is discussed as it is offered as the panacea without much substance. TDM is going to have to be aggressive and creative to put a dent in the transportation needs conversation. It is too bad that the development of a solid TDM program is lagging behind the balance of the TSP update - though there are some studies that plug in nicely to this effort. While parking management is a key part of a comprehensive TDM strategy - it carries a negative connotation. TDM needs to be cast in a more affirmative light - offering improved personal; health, enhanced community "livability" and convenient and safe mobility choices for all. The table listing and describing TDM strategies is a good one. I had trouble following the application of this framework. Who is to be required to submit a TDM plan? I suppose Figure 11 is getting to that... What incentives are available to pool (small) employers and institutions to promote and secure collective TDM incentives?</p>	Phil Selinger	We agree on the importance of framing the positive results of TDM programs, and appreciate your support for a strong program. On page 4 of Section 14 we clarified what types of development are proposed to provide what types of TDM plans (custom or pre-approved).	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
If we have big goals about non-SOV travel, the multimodal infrastructure should be a requirement, not an option. Right now the transportation impact mitigation is very auto-centric.	Oct. TEG mtg	To meet our performance targets we will need both more multimodal infrastructure and the TDM incentives to use the infrastructure. Expanding TDM plan requirements would complement our proposal to expand level of service (LOS) to incent developers to provide multimodal infrastructure. Expanding TDM requirements would also incent higher use of new public-sector multimodal investments through the major projects and citywide programs in the TSP.	Oct. TEG meeting notes
Trying to reach the community through a TMA is a good way to employ those TDM measures to reach your performance targets	Oct. TEG mtg	Encouraging TMA expansion is one option that we will explore for TDM service delivery.	Oct. TEG meeting notes
Is there a way to expand TDM to old buildings switching over to new management?	Oct. TEG mtg	Showing that we can use TDM on new projects is an important first step in that direction.	Oct. TEG meeting notes
Two general comments: 1) Page 6 has two tables. It's not clear what the incentives are for or paid to whom. Are they transit subsidies?	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	The tables are now on page 16 of Section 14. Yes, the incentive amounts are for transit subsidies paid to residents (first table) or employees (second table).	Email
2) On page 11, I would say that marketing should be to all tenants, not just those who do not own cars. It's always a possibility that marketing could lead someone to abandon their motor vehicle.	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	The "marketing" referenced here is for new tenants and the desire to attract no-car tenants to multi-family buildings with little or no parking.	Email
I would like to explore the potential role for TMA's or other organizations in delivering services. That would also require a look at what kind of City staff support might be available to help establish these groups and what funding they might be able to draw on for their work. As to fees I'd like to see a one-time fee if I could be certain PBOT wouldn't end up cutting the positions of those who do the ongoing monitoring. An auto ownership target would be nice, but it seems a great deal of monitoring would be required.	Linda Nettekoven	We intend to discuss TDM service delivery options in more detail with stakeholders in 2016.	Email

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>The mandatory TDM elements are a good start. I'm still concerned that in some parts of the city where much development has already occurred, there needs to be a way to play catch up with those building owners. There has to be some way to mandate a TDM plan perhaps when a building changes hands?? or else commit to the inclusion of systematic education/outreach for those buildings (via Smart Trips?). If we are expecting our Centers/Corridors to absorb 50% of the new growth, we need to focus on existing buildings (perhaps through the association of building managers?) as well as new construction.</p>	Linda Nettekoven	<p>We agree that expanding TDM to new buildings will be important in achieving our goals. We are partially addressing the issue by recommending that residential parking programs include a fee to fund TDM for existing multi-family buildings.</p>	Email
<p>OHSU has some feedback regarding the proposed amendment to Section 14 of City of Portland's Transportation System Plan (the TDM amendment). Thank you for keeping us involved and updated on the process and let me know if you need any clarification regarding this round of feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We want to ensure we're not asked to perform duplicative actions. We currently perform extensive monitoring in excess of what is required by the state and neighborhood agreements. Any City asks in this regard should acknowledge and be complimentary to current efforts without drawing resources from ongoing efforts. · In many ways our transportation programs are necessarily unique. Any City program should support this uniqueness and should avoid an extensive process of formal exceptions. • For aspects of the program operated at the bureau's discretion, we want to ensure the criteria for compliance is consistent year to year. • We ask that the cost of the program to organizations be minimized. Every dollar spent on fees is a dollar not directly invested into the program. • Any specific stipulations should only be made in context and with the input of the affected organizations. We request that PBOT form a stakeholder advisory committee to promulgate specific rules, and ask that OHSU be on that advisory committee. 	<p>John Landolfe, OHSU Transportation Options Coordinator</p>	<p>We agree with many of the points in this comment. We will continue stakeholder engagement in 2016.</p>	Email

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>The Portland Pedestrian Advisory Committee supports expanding Transportation Demand Management (TDM) requirements from campuses and institutions to mixed use zones and to employment sites within the Central City, as proposed by the Portland Bureau of Transportation as part of the Transportation System Plan update. TDM is a relatively quick, inexpensive, and effective strategy to increase walking, bicycling, and transit use in Portland. TDM is a critical strategy for managing traffic and parking demand. TDM is especially effective not only when combined with expanding pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure and service, but also when it includes disincentives to single-occupant auto use such as priced or restricted parking. We support key elements of the TDM proposal, including the requirement for residential and office buildings over a certain size threshold to provide residents and employees a “Mobility Incentive.” We support allowing employees and residents to choose how they want to use their Mobility Incentive, whether it’s for supporting walking, bicycling, or transit. We support the Incentive being substantive enough to change travel behaviors. The six month, \$600 incentive level seems reasonable, as does providing incentives to new residents and new employees over time.</p>	<p>Pedestrian Advisory Committee</p>	<p>Thank you; we agree.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>Although, my employer does not offer any incentive for me to bike, I still think it's not a good idea to make employers to offer incentive. If the property manager are going to unbundle parking with the building and the city issue permits for street parking. The extra cost or cost saving potential should be enough to incentivize employers to encourage their employee to use alternate mode of transport. Besides, the big employers downtown are already offering one form of incentive or another to encourage transit or bikes.</p>	<p>Patrick Mok</p>	<p>We appreciate the comment. In 2016 we will engage stakeholders to determine whether building owners or employers would be responsible for providing TDM incentives and information to employees.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>Forcing employer to offer incentive for employee to use alternate transport is like giving them a raise so that they can pay for the bus or bike. It should be up to the employee to see the cost saving by not need to buy a parking permit. It's redundant.</p>	<p>Patrick Mok</p>	<p>We appreciate the comment. In 2016 we will engage stakeholders to determine whether building owners or employers would be responsible for providing TDM incentives and information to employees.</p>	<p>Email</p>

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
Section 14 TDM: Is there any way to require a TDM Plan when a mixed use building changes owners or undergoes a remodel (over a certain size or amount) in addition to requiring them when a new building is constructed?	Linda Nettekoven	We agree that expanding TDM to new buildings will be important in achieving our goals. We are partially addressing the issue by recommending that residential parking programs include a fee to fund TDM for existing multi-family buildings.	Email



1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
 Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public Feedback on Section 15: Parking Objectives and Code

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
What would be the downside to unbundling parking from housing in city policies?	Oct. TEG mtg	This would need to be carefully coordinated with other policies. For example, in much of the city, we require parking to be built. If it is "unbundled" and on-street parking is free, we would be requiring developers to build something that tenants would have less incentive to use, because they have a free alternative.	Oct. TEG mtg notes
When do all the different parking strategies come together?	Oct. TEG mtg	Then Citywide Parking Strategy is not one single item. It will be adopted by City Council through separate legislative actions (centers and Corridors permit program, Central City zoning code, Performance Based Parking Management, etc.).	Oct. TEG mtg notes
What about putting in charging stations for bikes and for cars in parking spots.	Oct. TEG mtg	We have car charging spaces several locations downtown. In general, the allocation of particular parking spaces is a Parking Operations issue and not a policy-level decision.	Oct. TEG mtg notes
At the last CC Parking Committee Meeting, it was said bike parking was an important consideration but it seems absent from the current parking discussion.	Oct. TEG mtg	Bicycle parking code updates are proposed to occur in TSP Stage 3.	Oct. TEG mtg notes

The Discussion Draft public comment period was from Oct. 2, 2015 to Nov. 13, 2015.

For more information, please visit: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/63710>

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>Section 15: Parking Code Amendment - Commercial Parking in Mixed Use Zone: I have trouble following the pieces of this section as outlined - though they all are familiar as isolated subjects.</p> <p>I also agree with the following points already submitted by Garlynn Woodsong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing commercial parking outright in more mixed use zones: • Parking in mixed use zones should be un-bundled, priced, and capped. With these three things in place, if the structured parking in a building is sold/leased to people who otherwise have no relation to the building -- who cares? • Surface parking lots should be discouraged, taxed, disincentivized, or outright banned. • Purpose-built commercial parking garages should be heavily discouraged in all zones, and only allowed through a conditional use process, anywhere in the city, so that their effect can be measured against observed demand, mode share targets, VMT targets, and other considerations including the opportunity cost of not allowing the site to be used for its highest and best use. 	Phil Selinger	See above.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>Finally, there was some new language in Stage 1 related to new development (policies 9.62 as well as 9.10, 9.11 and 9.12). This language lacks a requirement that all new development construct street improvements consistent with the street classification. Seems obvious, but there are at least 12,500 examples where the city did not require developers to construct much needed transportation infrastructure at the time the property was developed. Now, many of the infrastructure gaps are on the Project List and particularly needed in Centers and Corridors. At a minimum, the TSP objectives need to elaborate on expectations for new development to avoid creating the same infrastructure gaps that we are dealing with in many parts of Portland today.</p>	Marianne Fitzgerald	<p>No change proposed. There are a number of TSP objectives for completion of transportation systems in a manner consistent with street classifications as part of both private development and public investments (e.g. modal street classification descriptions, and objectives 6.4.C, 6.22.B, 6.22. C, 11.11.B, 11.9.F, etc.) Recent neighborhood street plans (Cully, Division-Midway and Tryon-Stephens) were developed with the community to identify where traditional street improvements are needed most and the primary residential street connections, which are important parts of the active transportation networks despite being local service traffic streets. PBOT recently established a residential street program and is working on a Local Transportation Infrastructure Charge so developers can pay a fee in place of receiving a waiver of remonstrance. The LTIC is scheduled to go Council in March/April.</p>	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
It seems that bicycle parking should be considered as part of this work.	Keith Liden	Bicycle parking code updates are proposed to occur in TSP Stage 3.	Email/ TEG facilitator
I am, however, in favor of unbundling parking from the rental contracts. The more choices the better. However, I do hope that there is at least one parking spot per family or apartment unit.	Patrick Mok	Comments shared with the PBOT Centers and Corridors Parking Study project.	Email



1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
 Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public Feedback on Section 16: Street Vacation Code

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
17.84.025 Approval Criteria (p. 3) should be amended to definitively include retaining street ROW for pedestrian and bike pathways. The wording (public “facilities” and “bicycle/pedestrian spacing”) implies this is the case, but the code should be very clear. Using undeveloped street ROW for pathway connections in SW has been a huge benefit for mobility.	Keith Liden	Transportation function includes ped and bike.	Email/ TEG facilitator
On a related note, policies are in draft regarding the use of unimproved street ROW for pathways. As drafted, it includes a provision giving adjoining property owners veto power over the use of public street ROW for transportation purposes (walking/cycling). This approach is also found in the proposed Tryon-Stephens Plan heading to City Council. What is the status of this policy, and how does it relate to these code provisions?	Keith Liden	There is not a veto for neighbors here or in trails policy. Prior to a review property owner must demonstrate adjacent property owner support. The Tryon Stephens Plan recommendation relates to limiting auto access not allowing ped/bike access.	Email/ TEG facilitator
Section 16 street vacation code—approval criteria for vacating streets—it implies that vacation wouldn’t happen if there was a trail or pathway needed—more specificity wanted.	Oct. TEG meeting notes	Transportation function can include trails.	TEG Notes
"There shall be no encroachments that impede movement on the right of way." There should be something in the TSP that says that with the regards to street vacations.	Oct. TEG meeting notes	Separate encroachment policies.	TEG Notes

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
I'm glad this is going into Title 17. There are some folks (hopefully no longer at PBOT) who didn't take policy very seriously.	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Thanks!	Email
Someone in BPS told me that there will be no objectives to fill out the intent of the Policies in the Comp Plan (because there are so many of them). If this is true, how will the TSP objectives – many of them required by the Transportation Planning Rule (and currently incorporated into the existing Comp Plan) be adopted? We talked about this at our meeting, but it does seem problematic. I hope that the Policies of the Comp Plan, once adopted will be incorporated into the TSP with objectives – existing and new “assigned” to each Policy. It is so much easier on the reader if all the transportation policies and related objectives are in one place.	Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC	Comment is broader than street vacations; Objectives will be organized in the new 2035 TSP by Comp Plan "policy groupings" as shown in the Reference Section (p i-ii). This approach is consistent with the structure of the 2035 Comp Plan which grouped goals separately from policies.	Email
P 3. 17.84.025A1 change to "...needed for trails, public services, facilities,..."	Don Baack	Transportation function can include trails.	Email
A5 change to "...system of public streets, or trails, that is generally"	Don Baack	Transportation function can include trails.	Email
A6. Add "There is no evidence of current use as a trail nor community testimony suggesting a future use as a trail".	Don Baack	Unclear request, but trail needs to be an adopted in a plan, or proposed for inclusion in a plan. Additional trail analysis will be part of a future ped master plan update.	Email
The new criteria are an improvement, but neither here nor in the Comp Plan does there seem to be a process for engaging with area or modal representatives re: alternative uses for a street considered for vacation. Would street vacations fall under the notification system for the disposition of public property? At present there seems to be a 21 day notice process, too short for most neighborhoods or other groups that meet monthly to respond.	Linda Nettekoven	Process question and concern. Will work with appropriate PBOT and BPS Staff to look at these issues.	Email
Alternative use of streets/ROW There also needs to be a rethinking of the process and criteria that a community group could use if members have a plan for an alternative use of a street (bike or pedestrian path, community garden, parklet, etc.)	Linda Nettekoven	Process question and concern. Will work with appropriate PBOT and BPS Staff to look at these issues.	Email