



PORTLAND BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION

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
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
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
"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.	Metro	Updated. See corrections on page 9.	Email/ TEG facilitator

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
<p>Recommend switching order of regional plans in text to RTP, RTFP and UGMFP (and adding Regional Framework Plan – see comment 9)</p>	Metro	Updated. See corrections on page 9.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>UGMFP there is an added/unnecessary paren after 2012</p>	Metro	Updated. See corrections on page 9.	Email/ TEG facilitator