

Reference Number	Date Comment Submitted	Comment	PBOT Staff Comments
1	11/18/2014	Page 3, paragraph 3, "Specifically we're looking for the ....", this is the only time in the document the 1st person, plural, is used; elsewhere it is "City" or "PBOT". Should the document not stick with that here also?	incorporated
2	11/18/2014	Page 5, Step 5, paragraph 1, "initiating agency", and in paragraph 2 "applying agency"; these are terms that are new and unclear to me. Are they the same? To be taken literally? Is PBOT not always the "initiating agency"? I take it these two terms are used deliberately as being distinct from the earlier introduced term "applying organization". Maybe an accompanying list of definition of terms would be helpful	incorporated
3	11/18/2014	It is partly a philosophical and legal question whether adjacent neighbors have greater rights to how public land is used than the public that is farther away. The draft bestows such special rights. I can see that is a practical solution for PBOT, but not for me. I'd like to see some more flexibility on that matter or, perhaps, another approach.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
4	11/20/2014	SW Trails Plan map 3.1 should not be part of the trails process document because it was not created through a public participation process.	SW Urban Trails Plan Map 3.1 was adopted by Council
5	11/20/2014	Affected property owners should have the option to support trails with the condition that the trails not be advertised/published.	Interesting idea, could be something negotiated between the applying organization and the neighbors as terms of support for the trail.
6	11/20/2014	SWNI should not be a sponsor of volunteer trail building. SWTrails PDX and other sponsoring organizations should make sure they have insurance to cover volunteer trail building.	This is not a PBOT issue, but instead a conversation for SWNI and SW Trails.
7	11/20/2014	The trails process should include a fiscal impact statement with an estimate of the amount of staff time required in the first five years of implementation.	Could track this with a specific "Trails" billing code. Will look into this as an operational component of the program.
8	11/20/2014	Proposed trails must meet city policies (page 3, process framework). The trails process must prioritize trails that connect directly to transit, employment, education and services. To be used for transportation rather than recreation, trails should meet a Class C standard rather than Class B.	Class C standards might not be possible, but potentially could be encouraged and not cost prohibitive. Would encourage trail building organization to work with potential users to design the trail.
9	11/20/2014	Change passive voice to active voice on pages 4-6.	incorporated
10	11/20/2014	Pre app process should require sponsoring organization to demonstrate how they will provide surveying/engineering/design work, conduct public outreach, and supply labor/materials for construction/maintenance. Pre app should also require demonstration of how proposed trail meets city goals. If trail does not meet city transportation goals it should not move forward.	Yes - this will be done through the permitting process.
11	11/20/2014	Outreach conducted by sponsoring organization should have oversight from PBOT to ensure outreach is not biased. Clarity is needed on what opportunities for "feedback" means, and how feedback will be incorporated into design and permitting.	Yes, PBOT staff will maintain involvement and oversight of the "feedback" opportunities and process.
12	11/20/2014	City should approve trail design as part of permit process, and make sure trails are constructed to meet permit conditions. Design should be approved by a licensed engineer, and this engineer cannot be a part of the sponsoring organization.	The permitting process and engineering requirements would need to meet all current PBOT and BDS standards.
13	11/20/2014	Adjacent neighbors should have the option not to have a constructed trail published in walking maps, online, et cetera. Feeling that trail users are neighbors only may make property owners more willing to support a trail.	Interesting idea, could be something negotiated between the applying organization and the neighbors as terms of support for the trail.
14	10/29/2014	Title: consider calling this a prodcedure, process, or protocol rather than a policy.	incorporated

Reference Number	Date Comment Submitted	Comment	PBOT Staff Comments
15	10/29/2014	Page 1, paragraph 1: Clarify where the City's pedestrian transportation policy comes from.	incorporated
16	10/29/2014	Page 1, paragraph 2 & page 2, paragraph 5: Clarify when you say "plan" that you mean the SW Urban Trails Plan.	Fixed page 1, but not sure which occurrence is a problem on page 2
17	10/29/2014	Page 1, paragraph 2: Clarify who are considered "interested?"	"Interested" is used as a general term. The "interested" might vary depending on the trail.
18	10/29/2014	Page 1, paragraph 3: Street vacation, area parking permit, and local improvement districts are more processes than policies.	Deleted this reference
19	10/29/2014	Page 2, paragraph 1: Consider replacing "advantages" with "cost savings."	incorporated
20	10/29/2014	Page 2, paragraph 1, point 2: Considering adding something about available time and resources.	incorporated
21	10/29/2014	Page 2, paragraph 1, point 3: Cite source for community-built trails not needing to meet ADA.	<a href="http://www.americantrails.org/resources/accessible/access-board-guidelines.html">http://www.americantrails.org/resources/accessible/access-board-guidelines.html</a>
22	10/29/2014	Page 2: More info needed about Recreational Immunity.	incorporated
23	10/29/2014	Page 2: Where things are linked, also include at end for people reading a physical copy.	will include in an appendix
24	10/29/2014	Page 2: Include draft comp plan trails policy info	will include in an appendix
25	10/29/2014	Page 3, paragraph 1: typo - trails	incorporated
26	10/29/2014	Page 3, paragraph 1: clarify Metro's RATP.	incorporated
27	11/29/2014	Supportive of the Goose Hollow to Tyron Creek line (#6) and the connection from goose hollow to council crest, in particular the stairs from cable to 18th.	noted - not applicable to process
28		Step 2 p.4 Only one factor should be required to demonstrate connectivity need.	incorporated
29		Usage of Proposed Urban Trail Network and Map 3.1 to determine trails not requiring adjacent neighbor support. This map is too restrictive and does not reflect the consistent historical usage of certain ROWs. The SW Portland Walk Map ( <a href="https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/323776">https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/323776</a> ) is a better guide to historic use and community accepted trails.	Map 3.1 is the Council Adopted Trails network
30		The city should have some sort of mechanism short of city development of the trail to move critical trails with local opposition forward.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
31		The city has considerable resources and experience in regards to surveying, engineering, and environmental impact assesment. Some of these resources should be made available to the not for profit organization implementing an improved trail.	The City does not have resources to dedicate to this effort, thus the development of this <b>community-initiated</b> process.
32		Mutual Respect. This entire section is, unenforceable, not germane to policy, and basically should not be included in a policy document.	"Mutual Respect" section updated to reflect multiple comments
33		In Method #2, resident support of 50% is too high; should be 33%	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
34		25% for neighbor support is too high; should be 20%	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
35	12/11/2014	Would like a trail between Seymour Ct. and Corbett Ave. <a href="https://www.google.com/maps/dir/45.4887886,-122.6761181/@45.488909,-122.6759156,19z">https://www.google.com/maps/dir/45.4887886,-122.6761181/@45.488909,-122.6759156,19z</a>	noted - not applicable to process
36	12/15/2014	People need safe routes for accessing Tryon Creek Park, Lewis & Clark college, and bus 38 from TriMet.	noted - not applicable to process
37	12/23/2014	Neighbor approval should not be required because it's not required for other improvements in the right of way when neighbors are not paying for it.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments

Reference Number	Date Comment Submitted	Comment	PBOT Staff Comments
38	12/23/2014	Shouldn't need to prove the trail serves two purposes. This isn't required for other permitting.	Changed to "serving one purpose."
39	12/23/2014	The proposed process promotes neighborhood feuds.	noted
40	12/23/2014	Improvements shouldn't be limited to map 3.1	The process would allow improvements on any undeveloped ROW; those ROWs identified on map 3.1 would not require the "Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" component because they have been adopted by Council.
41	12/23/2014	Applicants should have more help from the city through the process, up to the same level as provided for LIDs.	The City does not have resources to dedicate to this effort, thus the development of this community-initiated process. For LID projects, adjacent property owners are required to pay for improvements and PBOT staff time.
42	12/23/2014	The mutual respect section should be removed.	"Mutual Respect" section updated to reflect multiple comments
43	12/23/2014	Remove the encroaching Jaqua/McGavick fence; improve safety, reduce fear and misinformation, reestablish Arnold Creek's only safe pedestrian connection to Tryon Creek Park and TLC Farm (and TLC Farm's only safe pedestrian connection to Stephenson Elementary School), allow the neighborhood association to function and enforce city code.	noted - not applicable to process
44	12/26/2014	The ability to walk to recreation, parks, and green spaces should be sufficient to justify a trail.	incorporated
45	12/26/2014	"Household" and "adjacent neighbors" are undefined terms. What about renters, multiple residents in a dwelling, absent property owners, and non-residential properties?	Defined in updated process for clarification.
46	12/26/2014	The requirement for adjacent neighbor approval can lead to nimby rejection.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
47	12/26/2014	If the city cannot help with funding there should be less stringent standards placed on construction.	City standards remain the same regardless of who is funding the project. There are many improvements that the City does not fund.
48	12/26/2014	Mutual respect section should be removed.	"Mutual Respect" section updated to reflect multiple comments
49	12/31/2014	Interested in making SW Taylor's Ferry Rd more walkable between Terwilliger and Spring Garden.	noted - not applicable to process
50	12/31/2014	Pg. 4. Remove my unit.	incorporated
51	12/31/2014	Pg. 5. Be more specific about which work group is "PBOT staff" here and how the work will be funded.	incorporated
52	12/31/2014	Page 5. Be more specific about what 25% means: Number of legal lots, front footage, total land, etc?	incorporated
53	12/30/2014	Make sure it is clear that trail development is limited to City of Portland ROW and not allowed on private land.	incorporated
54	12/30/2014	Include language that clarifies liability for adjacent property owners.	incorporated
55	12/31/2014	Don't assume trails are the highest and best use of the land. Humans are destructive to the environment.	noted
56	1/8/2015	PBOT needs to weigh the long term environmental impact of a growing trail system against the desires of individuals seeking new paths primarily for pleasure and/or convenience.	Environmental Permitting would require mitigation needed to protect the environment.

Reference Number	Date Comment Submitted	Comment	PBOT Staff Comments
57	1/14/2015	The proposed policy would make it harder for groups to build trails because neighbors have veto power and the City isn't providing enough financial and technical support. Also, the trails shouldn't be limited to map 3.1	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments. The process would allow improvements on any undeveloped ROW; those ROWs identified on map 3.1 would not require the "Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" component because they have been adopted by Council.
58	1/30/2015	Page 2 Para 1 bullet 2 edit correction change "available" to "availability"	incorporated
59	1/30/2015	Page 2 para 2 edit suggestion change "the right circumstances" to "appropriate circumstances"	incorporated
60	1/30/2015	Page 2 para 3 ORS reference – consider citing ORS 105.682 as well	incorporated
61	1/30/2015	Page 5 Options Chart Define "adjacent" with graphic examples – see Kristen if need clarity on this.	incorporated
62	1/30/2015	Page 5 Options Chart – could adjacent be "or within 400 feet" ??	incorporated
63	1/30/2015	Page 5 Step 4 – add "hiking (moderate challenge)" for clarity	incorporated
64	1/30/2015	Page 5 Step 5 – add "and state permits if applicable" after "appropriate City permits" (i.e. DSL – Division of State Lands for wetland impacts)	incorporated
65	1/30/2015	Page 5 Step 5 – add "drainage reserve" after "unmapped floodway"	incorporated
66	1/30/2015	Page 5 Step 5 - general comment – this area should really be fleshed out. A chart about what permits might be needed so that it is not a big surprise as people get into it. This should be developed with BDS. Someone from Parks, like Emily Roth, would also be valuable for input.	incorporated
67	2/8/2015	Should require homeowner approval and resident support before construction of a trail on an unimproved row.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
68	2/8/2015	Need clear and timely communication process with homeowners within 1/2 mile of a proposed trail.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
69	2/8/2015	Need strong environmental protections of casual footpaths.	Environmental Permitting would require mitigation needed to protect the environment.
70	2/9/2015	Need strong input from homeowners through clear and early communication before trail construction.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
71	2/17/2015	As homeowners currently impacted by one of the current SW walking trails We strongly support the concept that all homeowners in all neighborhoods adjacent to proposed trail construction have input with reasonable notice prior to granting permits for construction and throughout the process if there are substantive changes.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
72	2/18/2015	Need strong input from homeowners through clear and early communication before trail construction.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
73	2/18/2015	PBOT should anticipate mediating disputes between homeowners and SWTrails group.	noted
74	2/18/2015	Adjacent homeowners should be able to decide if a trail gets published on a map.	Interesting idea, could be something negotiated between the applying organization and the neighbors as terms of support for the trail.
75	2/18/2015	Method 3 should be deleted and neighborhood associations should have no input on whether a trail gets built.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
76	2/18/2015	Approval method should be 75% of adjacent property owners and 51% households within 1/2 mile.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments

Reference Number	Date Comment Submitted	Comment	PBOT Staff Comments
77	2/18/2015	Groups permitted to build trails should be responsible for maintenance and fined if they don't do it.	Maintenance agreement and violation enforcements will be clarified in the permit.
78	2/23/2015	Should have stronger environmental standards and review. Want trails near streams to do an Endangered Species Act review.	Environmental Permitting would require mitigation needed to protect the environment.
79	2/23/2015	At minimum, trails should meet Type B design. Trails to schools should meet Type C.	Could be an agreement between the applicant and the neighbors/community in order to get "Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" for the trail.
80	2/23/2015	Delete parks from step 2 number five since it is in number 4 already.	incorporated
81	2/23/2015	Should require resident approval, not just feedback.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
82	2/23/2015	Open House meeting should be required before resident petitions are circulated. PBOT should communicate the date,time,place info to all households within .5 mile 10 days before event.	Changed to the following, "At least three weeks before the petition and/or letter is submitted, the applying organization needs to host an open house or meeting. The open house could be facilitated as an information meeting, design charette, or however else the applying party deems useful. The open house must be open to the public, facilitated by the applying party, and be attended by the PBOT Staff member. All households within ½ mile of the ROW and the neighborhood association shall be notified of the public meeting at least two weeks before the meeting occurs."
83	2/23/2015	"...cannot say your proposed percentages are unfair" re: Step 3	noted
84	2/23/2015	Add to step five: "Urban Trails previously constructed by an organization applying for a permit must meet Portland Parks Trail Type B standards (as described in Process Framework, Trail Design, page 3) before a permit for new trail construction will be issued. New constructions must be maintained consistent with Portland Parks Trail Type B standards."	See footnote 2 on page 5
85	2/23/2015	Retain Mutual Respect statement as written.	noted
86	2/23/2015	Use a different phrase to describe the SW Urban Trails Plan (2000) to not have it seem like the work of the SW Trails PDX group.	The plan that was adopted by City Council in 2000 is called the "Southwest Urban Trails Plan"
87	2/19/2015	Clarify if process is for all of Portland or just SW	While originally thought that this process would be most useful in Southwest, the process would be available for any ROW throughout the City.
88	2/25/2015	Should be stronger environmental considerations for habitat connectivity.	Any trail would have to address environmental permitting issues and requirements.
89	2/24/2015	Concerned about past and future work of Don Baack and SW Trails PDX.	noted
90	24-Feb	Concerned about trail development leading to off-leash dogs pooping and scaring rabbits and deer.	Added "In addition, each trail should be clearly marked with signage that, at minimum, describes the difficulty of the trail, the destinations that the trail reaches, trail-use rules, and contact information for trail maintenance or other issues."
91	2/24/2015	Support strong input from homeowners and neighbors, strong communication before permitting and through construction	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
92	2/24/2015	Support strong environmental protection.	Any trail would have to address environmental permitting issues and requirements.
93	2/24/2015	Opposed to the tactics of SW Trails PDX.	noted
94	2/24/2015	Opposed to adjacent property owners being responsible for maintenance.	The current process requires the organization that would construct the trail to do maintenance.

Reference Number	Date Comment Submitted	Comment	PBOT Staff Comments
95	2/25/2015	Support strong input from homeowners and neighbors to address impact to environment and safety and privacy of homeowners.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
96	2/25/2015	Oppose requirement for adjacent neighbor approval. This makes it too difficult to construct pedestrian connections.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
97	2/25/2015	Oppose requirement for trails to serve two destinations. One should be enough.	incorporated
98	2/25/2015	The 2000 SW Urban Trails map is outdated. All public ROWS should be equally considered for improvements.	The 2000 SW Urban Trails Plan, Map 3.1 was adopted by Council. This process can be used for any unimproved public ROW.
99	2/25/2015	Permitting process should be streamlined and low-cost to trail building groups.	There are "Trail Exemptions" in City Code, if the proposed trail meets those requirements. PBOT will waive the encroachment permit fee to non-profit groups. The Bureau of Development Services has the responsibility of requiring the appropriate permits for the environment.
100	2/25/2015	Draft plan fails to address removal of encroachments, immunity from liability law, maintenance, an appeals process.	Not within the scope of this process
101	2/25/2015	Plan doesn't do enough to ensure involvement of homeowners in permitting, planning, and construction.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
103	2/21/2015	Don't call it the Southwest Urban Trails Plan because that makes it sound like the work of SW Trails PDX.	The plan that was adopted by City Council in 2000 is called the "Southwest Urban Trails Plan"
104	2/21/2015	Trail building immunity may not apply to trails build before HB2865 was passed.	noted
105	2/21/2015	All trails should meet Type B standards and address environmental mitigation.	incorporated
106	2/21/2015	All trails, even those in Map 3.1 should go through the approval process.	Map 3.1 was adopted by City Council.
107	2/21/2015	Approval should mean the support of 75% of adjacent property owners AND 51% of households within .5 miles.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
108	2/21/2015	Open house meeting must be 4-6 weeks prior to resident petitions.	Changed to the following, "At least three weeks before the petition and/or letter is submitted, the applying organization needs to host an open house or meeting. The open house could be facilitated as an information meeting, design charette, or however else the applying party deems useful. The open house must be open to the public, facilitated by the applying party, and be attended by the PBOT Staff member. All households within ½ mile of the ROW and the neighborhood association shall be notified of the public meeting at least two weeks before the meeting occurs."
109	2/25/2015	Enthusiastic support for SW Trails PDX and the plan.	noted
110	2/25/2015	Strongly support the City Wide working group proposed policies.	noted
111	2/26/2015	Support strong input from homeowners and neighbors, strong communication before permitting and through construction	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
112	2/26/2015	Support plan, and thinks it would be helpful to document objective benefits and costs of similar trails in US and world.	noted
113	2/26/2015	Support strong input from homeowners and neighbors, strong communication before permitting and through construction	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
114	2/26/2015	Enthusiastic support for the plan.	noted
115	2/26/2015	Trails in the public ROW shouldn't need neighbor approval even if they're not on the 3.1 map.	Noted. Map 3.1 was adopted by City Council as the SW Trail Network.
116	2/26/2015	Trails are needed. Adjacent owners should not be able to veto.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments

Reference Number	Date Comment Submitted	Comment	PBOT Staff Comments
117	2/26/2015	Trails should be ADA compliant, not just Type B because they are transportation, not recreation.	If the City was to construct the trail, they would be required to meet ADA standards.
118	2/26/2015	The City should inspect all existing trails and shut down trails found to be hazardous.	Current language: "Each permit shall be accompanied by a maintenance plan that will be created collaboratively by PBOT staff and the applying organization. Regular maintenance tasks shall be defined and individuals/groups shall be identified as to what tasks they are responsible for. The maintenance plan will also state how violations of the trail will be reviewed, time periods to remedy violations, and enforcement methods." Enforcement methods include closing the trail.
119	2/26/2015	Approval should mean the support of 75% of adjacent property owners AND 51% of households within .5 miles.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
120	2/26/2015	SW Trails PDX should not be allowed to build any new trails until it fixes the old ones and agrees to maintain new ones.	noted
121	2/26/2015	Support plan, but think adjacent homeowner support should be strong. Safety, privacy, and environmental impacts should be considered.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
122	2/26/2015	Opposed to any trails next to private property.	noted
123	2/26/2015	Support SW Trails PDX changes to the plan. Also, liability for adjacent property owners should be clarified.	noted and clarified
124	2/27/2015	Abutting and neighboring property owners should have right of refusal.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
125	2/27/2015	Support SW Trails PDX changes to the plan.	noted
126	2/27/2015	Support property owners having a say in the process.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
127	2/27/2015	Trails should be needed, not just desired, and weighed against environmental, safety, and privacy concerns.	See "Step 2. Determine if or how the proposed trail would increase connectivity."
128	2/27/2015	Nearby and adjacent neighbors needs to be better defined.	incorporated
129	2/27/2015	Maintenance, monitoring, and lack of maintenance needs to be addressed in the plan.	incorporated
130	2/27/2015	SW Trails should not dictate the City's trails policies.	noted
131	2/27/2015	SW Trails should not dictate the City's trails policies.	noted
132	2/27/2015	The environment should be considered more in the policy.	Any trail would have to address environmental permitting issues and requirements.
133	2/27/2015	Any mention of SW Trails PDX should be removed.	noted
134	2/27/2015	Submitted rewrite of the plan. In summary, support work of SW Trails PDX.	noted
135	2/27/2015	The only trails that should be allowed to appear on a walking map are the original seven in the "SW Portland Walking Map."	noted
136	2/27/2015	Approval should mean support of all adjacent property owners and a majority of neighbors. Neighborhood Associations should have no voice in approving trails.	Any trail would have to address environmental permitting issues and requirements.
137	2/27/2015	There should be a real need for a trail.	See "Step 2. Determine if or how the proposed trail would increase connectivity."
138	2/27/2015	Existing trails built without approval of adjacent property owners should be removed. If the property owners want to keep them, they should meet ADA standards.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
139	2/27/2015	All trails should meet ADA standards since they are supposed to be for transportation.	If the City was to construct the trail, they would be required to meet ADA standards.

Reference Number	Date Comment Submitted	Comment	PBOT Staff Comments
140	2/27/2015	Support SW Trails PDX changes to the plan.	noted
141	2/27/2015	Trail building rules should be just as stringent and consistent with rules governing ROW abandonment.	noted
142	2/27/2015	Remove praise and credit to SW Trails PDX at the beginning of document.	noted
143	2/28/2015	Remove parks from step two, # five.	incorporated
144	3/1/2015	Residents should give approval, not just feedback in step three.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
145	3/2/2015	Open House should be required before petitions are circulated.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
146	3/3/2015	Should require more than 50% approval from nearby households.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
147	3/4/2015	Even trails on Map 3.1 should have to go through the process.	Map 3.1 has been adopted by City Council.
148	3/5/2015	Trail building organizations should provide proof of notification of starting the permitting process to PBOT.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
149	3/6/2015	Strengthen maintenance requirements of the trail building organization.	The current process requires the organization that would construct the trail to do maintenance. See "Step 5. Obtain the applicable permits and Bureau review." for more information about the proposed maintenance agreement.
150	3/7/2015	Environmental impact needs to be addressed more in conservation and protected zones.	Any trail would have to address environmental permitting issues and requirements.
151	3/8/2015	Trails should be visible to neighbors and police.	Working with ONI's Crime Prevention Program to create design recommendation and offer suggestions for neighbors concerned about crime.
152	2/27/2015	Support approval described in step three.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
153	2/27/2015	There needs to be a clear communication process to homeowners within .5 mile about a permit request.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
154	2/27/2015	Environmental impacts should be considered.	Any trail would have to address environmental permitting issues and requirements.
155	2/27/2015	Support strong input from homeowners and neighbors, strong communication before permitting and through construction	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
156	2/27/2015	Support strong input from homeowners and neighbors, strong communication before permitting and through construction	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
157	2/27/2015	Support statements on residential support, approval methods, and mutual respect.	noted
158	2/27/2015	Add minimum two week advance notice of open house.	incorporated
159	2/27/2015	Approval should mean adjacent property owners support trail construction.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
160	2/28/2015	Environmental impacts should be considered.	Any trail would have to address environmental permitting issues and requirements.
161	2/28/2015	Trails should meet ADA standards.	If the City was to construct the trail, they would be required to meet ADA standards.
162	2/28/2015	The trails need to connect to safe pedestrian areas.	See "Step 2. Determine if or how the proposed trail would increase connectivity."



Reference Number	Date Comment Submitted	Comment	PBOT Staff Comments
163	2/28/2015	Maintenance should be addressed more in the plan.	The current process requires the organization that would construct the trail to do maintenance. See "Step 5. Obtain the applicable permits and Bureau review." for more information about the proposed maintenance agreement.
164	2/28/2015	Make sure trails are constructed within the ROW and not on private property through surveys and staking.	Would be required as part of the permitting process
165	2/9/2015	Support strong input from homeowners and neighbors, strong communication before permitting and through construction, adjacent owners should agree to construction.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
166	2/25/2015	Recommends addition of the Oregon Utility Notification Center	Will check w/ROW staff to see if this addition is necessary.
167	2/25/2015	Change "connectivity" terminology to "usefulness to the public."	Retained "connectivity" language since it's a transportation
168	2/25/2015	Instead of two locations, propose that an improved ROW would increase access to only one location	incorporated
169	2/25/2015	SW Trails adds "emergency escape and access routes" and an "other service"	Did not incorporate this because the "emergency escape and access routes" that neighborhood coalitions have defined these (e.g., <a href="https://www.portlandoregon.gov/pbem/article/394659">https://www.portlandoregon.gov/pbem/article/394659</a> ), are duplicative to destinations/services/transit.
170	2/25/2015	Gives weight to "demand" trails, even if they are not proposed in the SW Urban Trails Plan, and asks for evidence of walking to be sufficient to demonstrate public need. They also refer to "Potential Pedestrian Routes," which were all the routes the public proposed during the SW Urban Trails Plan outreach, not necessarily approved by Council.	For trails that are currently proposed (on map 3.1) in the SW Urban Trails Plan, SW Trails' and PBOT's proposed process is similar – notify adjacent property owners and try to work with them to reach the optimal design.
171	2/25/2015	informing neighbors through public meeting and outreach through the neighborhood coalition newsletter and local media should serve as the "public involvement" requirement.	"Public Involvement and Neighborhood Support" section updated to reflect multiple comments
172	2/25/2015	Process should address obstructions to the ROW into this section, requiring PBOT to remove any obstructions if a demand trail is present. PBOT already would ask for encroachments to be removed if it inhibits a permitted activity on the ROW.	Demand trails are outside the scope of this process. If obstructions were present on a permitted trail, PBOT would have authority to remove the obstructions.
173	2/25/2015	Integrates the following language, "permits...may be waived at the discretion of the permitting organization" and references past City funding.	incorporated
175	2/25/2015	SW Trails includes a "Decision and Appeal" framework in this section which recommends a 10-day decision schedule, and appeal hierarchy of PBOT director, Commissioner, and City Council.	Appeals are outside the scope of this process