



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 3: Community Involvement Policies

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p><b>Section 3: Coordination and Involvement Policies, Page 3:</b></p> <p><b>The question is posed:</b></p> <p><b>Do we need to make sure the coordination policies from Chapter 8 (and/or Chapter 2) are physically located in our document?</b></p> <p><b>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.)</b></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><b>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.]</b></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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Objective 6.23.C. (Bike Transportation) - Improve the quality of the pedestrian environment by implementing pedestrian design guidelines...</li> <li>• Objective 6.8.D. (Ped Classifications) - Off-Street Paths. Improvements. Use the Pedestrian Design Guide to design Off-Street Paths</li> </ul> <p>Pedestrian Design Guidelines – Section D Guidelines for Pathways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>Email/ TEG facilitator</p>
<p><b>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.</b></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><b>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.</b></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><b>6.2.C. Change to read "Encourage walking by providing route signage including clear wayfinding signs, maps, and by developing education ....."</b></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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Objective 6.23.C. (Bike Transportation) - Improve the quality of the pedestrian environment by implementing pedestrian design guidelines...</li> <li>• Objective 6.8.D. (Ped Classifications) - Off-Street Paths. Improvements. Use the Pedestrian Design Guide to design Off-Street Paths</li> </ul> <p>Pedestrian Design Guidelines – Section D Guidelines for Pathways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p>Email</p>

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p><b>F. Change the order to read "emphasis on personal safety, health, neighborhood livability and environmental consequences."</b></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><b>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.</b></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><b>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.</b></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>