

PBOT

PORTLAND BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION

1120 SW Fifth Ave., Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503-823-5185
Fax 503-823-7576 TTY 503-823-6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Chloe Eudaly Commissioner **Chris Warner** Director

September 26, 2019

Staff Response to Public Comments on 2019 Minor TSP Update Discussion Draft

The 2019 Minor TSP Update Discussion Draft was open for public comments from August 1, 2019 – September 6, 2019. During this time period, comments were received via email, phone, and in person. Upon completion of the comment period, staff reviewed public comments and, where appropriate, incorporated changes into the Proposed Draft.

This document lists all the comments that were received from individuals and organizations. It also includes a staff response to all comments. The comments and responses are presented below in order by chapter starting with comments that were general and not chapter-specific.

Public input is a vital component of the Transportation System Plan. Thank you to everyone who took the time to review the Discussion Draft and to provide us with your feedback.

For additional questions about public comments, please contact:

Bob Kellett
Project Lead
(503) 823-6127
bob.kellett@portlandoregon.gov



The Portland Bureau of Transportation fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the ADA Title II, and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. For accommodations, complaints and information, call (503) 823-5185, City TTY (503) 823-6868, or use Oregon Relay Service: 711.

Comments on the Overall TSP Update		
Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response
If pedestrian safety is the priority, why are not ALL urban and city-wide traffic lights with cross walk signals functioning at ALL times; 1) to slow traffic (going through? use the freeways)., and, 2) an emphasis on pedestrian awareness. Today's technology should be able to detect if a crosswalk is in use or not and adjust timer accordingly. And we pedestrians need to use common sense and a little extra caution when walking along and crossing our public roads.	Wesley E.	Traffic lights are designed to facilitate safe movement for all system users. PedPDX performed analysis to see where and when crashes involving pedestrians occur at signalized intersections. PedPDX includes several recommendations for improving safety at controlled intersections.
Walking in downtown Portland will not be safe until you get the e-scooters off our sidewalks.	Larry F.	This comment has been forwarded to the staff that manage and evaluate the e-scooter pilot project.
I've received the TSP update. What is to be provided for children, the elderly, and the disabled? (I am 2 out of 3 of those.) Not everyone can get around by bike.	Wendy P.	The TSP includes policies and projects that provide transportation options for all ages and abilities.
The comprehensive details covered in the TSP are daunting and impressive. From motorized and non-motorized vehicular planning to pedestrian access and safety, the plan's objectives appear to be very thorough. I appreciate the attempts to improve the plan's clarity and consistency. Due to its length and breadth, I did not take to time to read it in entirety, but I was focused on a few aspects that have concerned me in the past. Urban policies, by their nature, seem to be written with precision and with inclusion of many needs and visions. What I struggle with, at times, is the excessive verbiage that attempts to cover every possible permutation of policy options, though this recent revision makes improvements to this tendency. My main concern, previously reported in an email, has to do with how data is collected, analyzed, and used to inform changes to PBOT objectives. Over the past year, from information I've gleaned from Police and PBOT flash alerts/email, it appears as if traffic fatalities involving motorized vehicles and pedestrians, bicyclists, and scooter riders has increased (despite the intent of the Zero Vision program). I'm not laying any blame, but I do have a few questions of the data: 1. has the added barriers at intersections improved safety for pedestrians and bikers 2. is it possible that the many added 'roadway features' (mini-stop signs on pedestrian walks, added lines and narrowing lanes, green crosswalks for bikes, etc) provides too much 'input' for drivers to navigate, and could they actually 'hamper' their decision making? (Is more really better?) 3. given Portland's unique 'narrow road' system (compared to many other cities), is it really prudent to add more transportation options (ie scooters)? Can the current infrastructure really handle it?	Chris P.	Data collection and data-driven decision-making is a major component of Vision Zero and it is a focus of PBOT's recently released Strategic Plan. PBOT continues to evaluate the effectiveness of new designs and roadway treatments at intersections. A recent example is a pilot project to slow down the movement of left turns at intersections. This pilot is looking at before and after data to determine its effectiveness. Portland's narrow roads provide both challenges and benefits such as slowing down automobile speeds and shortening crossing distances. The TSP provides policy and project direction to help develop a more complete network that supports an increasing number of transportation options.

<p>Again, I appreciate the dauntless task you have in configuring citywide objectives to improve our transportation infrastructure, while encouraging safety and health enhancing policies. I would hope that as data continues to come in on successes and problems, that we (the public) can be apprised of how PBOT's implementation plan is informed by this data.</p>		
<p>The concept of general connectivity: Lack of continuity in paved streets, sidewalks, and bicycle lanes in our area is a notable barrier to travel, even by motor vehicle. A well-connected network is needed to increase accessibility and reduce the funneling of all modes of traffic onto a few roads.</p>	SE in Active Motion Letter	<p>The TSP includes policies and projects that support the development of a more complete and connected transportation network. Improving connectivity and increasing transportation options is a key strategy for accommodating future growth.</p>
<p>We strongly urge 2019 Minor Update to the Transportation System Plan to identify gaps that remain within the citywide greenway network in the 1-5 year time frame and work to eliminate fragmentation of the greenway network wherever gaps are found within the 1-5 time frame.</p>	BikeLoudPDX	<p>PBOT continues to evaluate and build out the greenway network and to implement recommendations from the Neighborhood Greenway Assessment Report. A project of the scale you've proposed would involve significant public involvement before it could be considered for inclusion in the TSP.</p>
<p>Chapter 1: TSP Introduction</p>		
<p>Public Feedback</p>	<p>Commenter</p>	<p>Staff Response</p>
<p>p. 11 - relationship of plans - would it not make sense to list the Enhanced Transit Corridors Plan (ECT) here since it's now being used to add projects?</p>	Chris S.	<p>Good suggestion. We will update the graphic to reflect the relationship to The Enhanced Transit Corridors plan.</p>
<p>We support enhanced transit projects throughout the city, and in particular welcome "pro time" and other enhancements for buses traveling on Foster Road and connecting travelers with the Lents Town Center and the MAX Green Line. We encourage adding the Enhanced Transit Corridors Plan to the diagram titled "TSP: Relationship to Other Plans" on p. 11 of the update.</p>	SE in Active Motion Letter	<p>Good suggestion. We will update the graphic to reflect the relationship to The Enhanced Transit Corridors plan. We will also share your thoughts with our transit coordinator.</p>
<p>Update the diagram titled "TSP : RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS" (Chapter 1, page 11 in 2035 TSP Update) to include the Enhanced Transit Corridors Plan. The Enhanced Transit Corridor Plan is referenced elsewhere within the document and deserves to be included at the same level of current plans and not within the miscellaneous category of "Other</p>	BikeLoudPDX Letter	<p>Good suggestion. We will update the graphic to reflect the relationship to The Enhanced Transit Corridors plan.</p>

Plans and Policies.”		
Chapter 2: Policies		
Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response
<p>p. 22 - I'm frustrated that we continue to rely on LOS. How is development of alternative measures progressing? With regard to including table 9-2, I agree it's confusing NOT to have the table included. But the table is not well labeled. I assume the metric is volume/capacity, but it should be clearly labeled.</p>	Chris S.	<p>Thank you for the suggestion regarding the 9-2 table. We will include clarifying language that will improve its readability and usefulness.</p> <p>A PBOT-led project to update the performance measures is getting underway. This will likely lead to new measures for the impact from development (LOS) and the measurement of system-wide performance (V/C). The intention of this project is to better align the TSP's goals and policies with the measures that are used to determine impacts and mitigations.</p> <p>Additionally, ODOT and Metro have started a process to update the interim regional mobility standards (V/C), which have been in place since the early 2000s. It is anticipated that these projects will amend the TSP's policies the next time the TSP is updated. For this update, we are simply making sure the existing tables are included in the Comprehensive Plan.</p>
<p>I saw this commentary about adding LOS tables to the Comp plan. Commentary The 2035 Comprehensive Plan policies 9.49.j, 9.49.k, and 9.49.l reference Table 9.1 and Table 9.2. These tables appear in the Transportation System Plan but not in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan. To avoid confusion and maintain consistency, it is proposed that Table 9.1 and Table 9.2 be added to the Chapter 9 of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and that the administrative note be removed.</p>	Allan R.	<p>A PBOT-led project to update the performance measures is getting underway. This will likely lead to new measures for the impact from development (LOS) and the measurement of system-wide performance (V/C). The intention of</p>

<p>However, this is the wrong direction. Why not just re-write the section to remove Level of Service entirely. Level of Service planning has proven to increase auto use and dependence and that is not what we want as a city</p> <p>We are be trying to build a city for less cars - this is written down in the green triangle, and in 9.49.e. By 2035, increase the mode share of daily non-drive alone trips to 70 percent citywide, ...</p> <p>Continuing to carry water for Level of Service based planning and annual trip increase projections is not going to get us there.</p>		<p>this project is to better align the TSP's goals and policies with the measures that are used to determine impacts and mitigations.</p> <p>Additionally, ODOT and Metro have started a process to update the interim regional mobility standards (V/C), which have been in place since the early 2000s. It is anticipated that these projects will amend the TSP's policies the next time the TSP is updated. For this update, we are simply making sure the existing tables are included in the Comprehensive Plan.</p>
<p>We are disappointed that level-of-service (LOS) remains a mean to evaluate the efficiency of transportation facilities (see Table 9-1, Chapter 2 pages 22-23 in 2035 TSP Update - Discussion Draft). Unimpeded travel flow is the top goal of LOS and increases conflict for LIT accessing and crossing streets. Lower traffic speeds result in decreased fatal outcomes for all traffic modes. Congestion relief can be mitigated through investments in LIT and transit infrastructure that transport more people per square foot than single occupancy vehicles allow.</p>	<p>BikeLoudPdx Letter</p>	<p>A PBOT-led project to update the performance measures is getting underway. This will likely lead to new measures for the impact from development (LOS) and the measurement of system-wide performance (V/C). The intention of this project is to better align the TSP's goals and policies with the measures that are used to determine impacts and mitigations.</p> <p>Additionally, ODOT and Metro have started a process to update the interim regional mobility standards (V/C), which have been in place since the early 2000s. It is anticipated that these projects will amend the TSP's policies the next time the TSP is updated. For this update, we are simply making sure the existing tables are included in the Comprehensive Plan.</p>

<p>p. 26 - "New Mobility" - I agree that "connected and automated" is not keeping up with the evolution of the sector. "New Mobility" is a convenient catch all, but the I'm also hearing "shared mobility" and "micro mobility" (referring the vehicles under 500 kg). During PSC discussion of this update I'd like to hear what PBOT's perspective is on how these modes are affecting the system. Both shared mobility (including ride hailing providers like Uber and Lyft) and micro mobility (e.g., scooters) appear to have some combination of enabling additional trips as well as shifting trips between modes. I'd like to know what our best understanding of this effect is.</p>	<p>Chris S.</p>	<p>Over the past year, PBOT has stood up a New Mobility team that is looking at these very questions. We continue to collect and analyze the data and impacts from New Mobility to better inform the policy decisions. This includes PBOT's Scooter Pilot 1.0 evaluation report https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/78431) and the interactive map: https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/709688</p>
<p>I'm also interested in City policy on implementation of micro mobility. For example I find it striking that we've required scooter vendors to have availability in East Portland, but the bikeshare system chartered by the City has no service in East Portland. Also, what are our plans to add electric bikes to the bikeshare system?</p>	<p>Chris S.</p>	<p>PBOT is intent on continuing BIKETOWN's extension of service to East Portland. In fall 2019, PBOT will post a Request for Proposal for a vendor to expand the system and to add e-bikes. Expanding the system to East Portland in 2020 is expressly noted in the RFP. We expect the new bikeshare system will be composed at least half, if not solely, electric pedal-assist bikes.</p> <p>The difference in geographic coverage of BIKETOWN and e-scooter share is also the product of both timing and business model. Under the current model, BIKETOWN is reliant on public dollars and private sponsorship to expand the system. (The new RFP changes this structure and places capital investment responsibilities on the service provider). Our two sponsorship agreements with Nike and Kaiser Permanente funded the</p>

	<p>increase of the initial system to 1,000 bikes (from a previously planned 600), and cover the deficit between the cost to operate the system and system revenues. PBOT has prioritized its discretionary revenue for projects and services in lieu of bike share expansion. As you know by contrast, e-scooter share capital and operating costs (aside from the administrative regulative costs) are funded solely by the service providers. We chose to exercise our regulatory authority to increase mobility access to underserved populations by requiring a percentage of scooters to be deployed in East Portland.</p> <p>While BIKETOWN does not serve significant portions of the city, our equity programs are robust. Our Adaptive BIKETOWN program is a national model for increasing bicycle access to people with disabilities. BIKETOWN for All, our membership program for people living on low incomes, provides unlimited rides for \$3 per month without any fees for parking out of hub or outside of the service area. In 2018, we instituted a Pay it Forward plan which makes the first month of BIKETOWN for All free. Users can eliminate their monthly membership fee by returning at least three BIKETOWN bikes found outside a station to one of the 150-plus stations. Through increased outreach and partnerships with</p>
--	--

		<p>Streetroots, Central City Concern, and other social service providers we increased BIKETOWN for All membership to 500 people in 2018. Our BIKETOWN for All members average over 70 annual trips per user and represent 20% of all BIKETOWN annual and monthly member trips.</p> <p>Our BIKETOWN 2018 Annual Report includes more information about these two programs and overall system performance</p>
<p>Finally, I'm not seeing a lot of adoption of the acronym FAVES. I see more use of CASE (Connected Autonomous Shared Electric) but I'm not sure any acronym has really landed yet and I wonder if we should avoid using an acronym in a policy document at this point.</p>	<p>Chris S.</p>	<p>You're correct to point out that this is an evolving field and that there isn't an agreed upon acronym. This could be revisited in future TSP updates.</p>
<p>p. 27, paragraph a. (Data Sharing) - while having data to inform operations and policy is vital, how are we squaring this with the new privacy guidance adopted by Council as part of the smart cities initiative? It can be frighteningly easy to deanonymize trip data.</p>	<p>Chris S.</p>	<p>It is important to strike the right balance between obtaining the information that cities need to fulfill our responsibility to ensure the health, safety, and well-being of the public, while also ensuring that appropriate protections are in place to protect personal privacy. Mobility data is important because it allows us to more effectively regulate providers and it provides us with information that planners can use to make smarter investments.</p> <p>Given the City's new, adopted-Privacy and Information Protection Principles, PBOT is looking closely at our practices around the geolocation data that we collect from providers, like e-scooter</p>

		companies. We are actively looking to embody these principles by putting protections in place, such as minimizing what data we collect, aggregating data both spatially and temporally to ensure privacy, and limiting access to data based on the roles of different users. In this arena, PBOT is working very closely with BPS, the City Attorney’s Office, and other data experts around the city and in industry to identify and implement best practices in data governance and data protection. PBOT is also actively working to promote openness in our data, working with partners to release as much information as possible to the broader public in a timely manner.
p. 27, paragraph c. (Wayside communication) - I'm curious why we've retained "connected and automated" here. Shouldn't this also shift to "new mobility"? My scooter or ebike might want to consume this info as much as an AV would.	Chris S.	This is a good suggestion. We agree that the policy should be changed to New Mobility vehicles and services.
Finally, we champion new mobility in all its forms, e.g., cycling, scootering, skateboarding. Unfortunately, our lack of infrastructure and current (but rapidly changing) low density place us at a disadvantage. We don’t have Biketown, for example, and we don’t see many residents on scooters or skateboards. Please don’t leave us behind (and “us” extends to Cully as well). The “last mile” connection is a salient issue due to network disconnectivity and missing infrastructure as well as an absence of mobility services.	SE in Active Motion Letter	We agree. That is why as part of the second year of the e-scooter pilot we required companies to deploy them in all pattern areas and incent them to increase use in traditionally underserved areas as well. Proposed Policy 9.68.d directs us to take an equity-focused approach to New Mobility.
p. 29 and following, remapping of objectives to sub-policies - it's unclear to me from the description which policy these sub-policies will be attached to? This is an editorial comment rather than a policy one.	Chris S.	These sub-policies are attached to the Comprehensive Plan’s Chapter 2 policies. These are already in the TSP and are simply being re-labeled.
Chapter 3: Classifications		
Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response

<p>In the Comp Plan update last year, some of the formerly designated Major Walkways were dropped with the staff explanation that they no longer function as major walkways, but still could be developed as neighborhood walkways. Stars on the map are important to retain that possibility. Please show on in the Transportation System Plan those routes designated as neighborhood walkways. One that I called for retaining was the SE 6th Avenue route. Providing alternative walkways for those of us who are less able to dodge commuter bicycles on the Springwater Trail enhances our safety and enjoyment.</p>	<p>Michael H.</p>	<p>The stars on the map that appear on the city's zoning maps as future walkways have been retained as part of PedPDX's recommended classifications.</p>
<p>I read the update to the TSP. I'd ask you to consider whether there are other updates to major bikeways and walkways in SW Portland that SWIM did not cover. For example, upgrading SW Fairmount Blvd to a major city bikeway, Upgrading Taylors Ferry Road, Garden Home Road, Shattuck, Dosch, SW Corbett, to major city bikeways.</p> <p>I had a hard time figuring out how to read this map, so I'm sorry if those I listed are already major city bikeways.</p>	<p>Ramtin R.</p>	<p>The streets that you have identified are currently City Bikeways in the TSP and align with the Regional Bikeways classification in the RTP. We are not proposing to change this during this TSP update.</p>
<p>p. 57 and following, adjustments to Major City Bikeway network (MCB) - I appreciate the alignment of the network to Metro's regional system in the RTP. However, it strikes me that there are two glaring problems with the MCB network:</p> <p>a) Sandy is a Civic Corridor, Major Traffic Street, Major Transit Priority Street and will now become a Major City Walkway, but retains a lower bicycle classification. It seems to me that this major diagonal connector through the city should also be a MCB.</p> <p>b). Network does not reflect the built character of the NE Going (at least as far east as 42nd), which clearly operates as an MCB</p>	<p>Chris S.</p>	<p>For this update, we looked at where there are differences between the classifications in the TSP and RTP. Both NE Sandy and NE Going are City Bikeways in the TSP and Regional Bikeways in the RTP. There are current and upcoming planning projects involving NE Sandy – a Metro/TriMet Regional ETC Pilot Program evaluation and draft concept development of Enhanced Transit west of 82nd Ave, an evaluation of a potential streetcar alignment from NW Portland to Hollywood, and a land use and transportation study involving the portion of NE Sandy in Parkrose. This planning is considering the City Bikeway classification and will help inform any future classification changes.</p>
<p>Classify Sandy Blvd as a Major City Bikeway. No single modification to the Transportation System Plan would have as great of effect as building Sandy Blvd into the next Major City Bikeway. LIT requires direct access to neighborhood centers and commercial streets and Sandy Blvd is uniquely positioned to deliver on this point.</p>	<p>BikeLoudPDX Letter</p>	<p>For this update, we looked at where there are differences between the classifications in the TSP and RTP. NE Sandy is a City Bikeway in the TSP and Regional Bikeway in the</p>

		<p>RTP. There are current and upcoming planning projects involving NE Sandy – a Metro/TriMet Regional ETC Pilot Program evaluation and draft concept development of Enhanced Transit west of 82nd Ave, an evaluation of a potential streetcar alignment from NW Portland to Hollywood, and a land use and transportation study involving the portion of NE Sandy in Parkrose. This planning is considering the City Bikeway classification and will help inform any future classification changes.</p>
<p>The following are especially important to us given our area’s needs: Four proposed bikeway classifications: The 20s, 50s, Foster Road, and SE Flavel Drive.</p>	<p>SE in Active Motion Letter</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
<p>I wanted to make the general comment that there needs to be a timeline set for enforcing the additional ROW dedications that will be associated with the ped classification combined with the addition of pedestrian districts. Telling owners/developers that they “might” need to dedicate an extra 3’ based on when they submit for permit without giving them a date of when it will start to be enforced does not work. Understanding the property limits is crucial during the design process of the building.</p>	<p>Martha W.</p>	<p>There are state and regional requirements involving the legislative process to update a TSP. This process does not always start with a certain end date. The best we can do is provide an expected timeline. We understand the desire for certainty and will communicate the timeline as it becomes more certain.</p>
<p>Would it be appropriate for the Ped District to include 25th up to Thurman? Those 4 blocks that are excluded on the current map north of Pettygrove are right at and approaching Wallace Park and Chapman Elementary. Ped use is already high there, and with multi-family housing being built and planned north of Thurman those blocks will see more peds accessing the park and school (among many other destinations).</p>	<p>Scott K.</p>	<p>The intent of the pedestrian district is to match transportation policy with land use policy. This area falls outside the adopted center boundary in the Comprehensive Plan. NW 25th is designated a City Walkway south of Thurman which acknowledges its higher order role in the network.</p>
<p>Map D2 (page 53) needs to be revised to make the entirety of SW 55 from Taylors Ferry Road to Pasadena a Neighborhood Walkway. This street is a major connector to transit service on Taylors Ferry Road, and provides access to Dickinson Park and local trails. This</p>	<p>Marianne F.</p>	<p>This is a good suggestion that helps connect the pedestrian network. In the TSP Update Proposed Draft, it</p>

is in addition to the walkway identified on SW Alfred and SW 48th.		will be proposed as a Neighborhood Walkway.
Chapter 5: Modal Plans		
Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response
Chapter 6: Implementation Strategies		
Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response
p. 74 - RTP Corridor studies - I'm struck that descriptions of these major corridor studies make no reference to climate. What do the chartering sections of the RTP say on this, and how do they relate to climate goals in the RTP?	Chris S.	<p>Climate is one of the core policy priorities that guided the development of the 2018 RTP. The RTP assesses climate goals at the system level based on the balance on investments within and across corridors. Future corridor studies will need to address that as well as the other policy priorities including equity, safety, and mobility.</p> <p>The future corridor studies referenced in the TSP are just a subsection of the RTP's overall implementation chapter. The corridors identified in the TSP are the ones that are located within Portland. There is also other regional planning work that is not tied to geography that will involve Portland including the Regional Mobility Policy update, Regional Congestion Pricing Technical Analysis, TSMO strategy update, and MAX tunnel study. The full list of regional planning and projects can be found here: https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2019/04/02/2018-RTP-Chapter-8-Moving-Forward.pdf</p>

<p>Strengthen Chapter 6: Implementation Strategies. This chapter is extremely weak. It doesn't really talk about implementation at all. It simply talks about more plans to be cranked out. This is especially troubling because the final draft of SWIM implementation chapter doesn't say enough about implementation either. Both plans say little in regard to how they will be implemented and commit to nothing. This leaves us in an implementation vacuum with no guidance for the city and its citizens as to how projects will get built. I appreciate all the uncertainty relating to money and politics, but we should at least have a basic outline and understanding about how the city intends to involve the public, refine projects, fund them, and build them. How will PBOT honestly and transparently evaluate progress made in completing the projects listed in both the TSP and SWIM plan? PBOT needs to stop making it up as it goes along (or at least appearing to do so).</p>	Keith L.	The purpose of the implementation strategies chapter is to identify future work that is needed to help realize the goals and policies of the TSP. As part of an upcoming update to the Climate Action Plan, PBOT will be developing shorter-term benchmarks, measurements, and strategies to evaluate projects and strategies. This work will feed into a future update of the TSP.
<p>Use the TSP to Describe In Motion Plan Implementation. As I mentioned during our meeting, PBOT should very seriously consider including an implementation chapter in the TSP that clearly articulates how the TSP and the supporting refinement plans, especially all of the In Motion plans, will be implemented. The city shouldn't have a different, or simply ad hoc, process for NW, East Portland, Central City, SW, etc. To the extent possible, it should be the same for all, and funding to support each should be fairly and rationally allocated. For the SWIM (and NWIM that will soon follow), this could mean that it would refer to the TSP regarding the implementation framework and process and not have a unique process compared to other refinement plans.</p>	Keith L.	Thank you for this suggestion. We will continue to look at ways to improve our implementation strategies chapter and articulate how refinement plans like the "In Motion" plans are implemented.
<p>Glossary of Transportation Terms</p>		
<p>Public Feedback</p>		
<p>On 7/14/2017 I submitted comments on the definition for the terms "access" and "accessibility" and how it affects interpretation of the TSP, and PBOT response was that "these terms are not under review". I am re-sending those comments now because the glossary is being revised in this 2019 update (p. 77) and it seems important to make sure transportation improvements are accessible to people of all abilities, in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. This is especially important because the Comp Plan policies for Western Neighborhoods seem to over-rely on trails, and Southwest In Motion over-relies on alternative street designs, and these may or may not be compliant with ADA. Even the language regarding Pedestrian Districts does not refer to ADA compliance. The Comp Plan definition for "Access" says "free from physical barriers for those with limited mobility" but that is not enough; alternative designs may use surface treatments that are not ADA compliant or used on streets with high traffic volumes and speeds so the definition needs to be expanded to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act. The Comp Plan definition for "accessibility" refers to the ability to move from one mode of transportation to another mode or to a destination without any reference to ADA compliance. Western Neighborhoods active transportation (page 57 of the TSP) says "Provide safe and accessible pedestrian and bicycle connections, as well as</p>	Marianne F.	Thank you for this suggestion. Development of an ADA Transition Plan, which includes strategy for barrier removal, curb ramp prioritization, review of published rules and regulations, and the development of internal guidance policy is underway. The ADA Transition Plan will include a glossary of terms that will inform future TSP updates.

<p>off-street trail connections, to and from residential neighborhoods." Western Neighborhoods Trails goes on to describe a system that is not ADA compliant. The definition of accessible needs to be expanded to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.</p>		
<p>Appendix A: Major Projects List</p>		
<p>Public Feedback</p>	<p>Commenter</p>	<p>Staff Response</p>
<p>Project list - the new projects proposed for addition are laudable on an individual basis, but I see no review of the collective impacts:</p> <p>a) Many millions of dollars are being proposed to be added to the financially constrained project list. How will this be financially balanced? Is there new revenue? Are other projects coming out?</p> <p>b) During the development of the TSP project, a careful equity scoring process was used. Has a comparable equity screen been conducted for these projects? How will they affect the overall equity balance?</p>	<p>Chris S.</p>	<p>All proposed projects were evaluated as part of their initial planning project (i.e. ETC, GTC) as well as part of this TSP update. For the TSP update, the evaluation criteria were the same as the previous development of the major projects list. The criteria are equity, safety, neighborhood access, economic benefit, health, climate, cost effectiveness, and community support. For each criterion, the project receives a score. The composite scores from this evaluation were compared to the existing project list as an input to determine project timeline.</p> <p>Preliminary scoring of projects for the equity criterion was completed using demographic data compiled by BPS to support the 2018 Vulnerability Analysis. Projects were scored based on BPS Total Vulnerability Risk Factors, a composite risk score for census tracts in Portland that have higher-than-citywide average populations vulnerable to changing economic conditions. Vulnerable populations include renters, communities of</p>

	<p>color, low educational attainment, and low median family income. Raw equity scores were classified into 4 quantiles. Based on this analysis, 23 out of the 27 the proposed projects scored in the top two quantiles for equity. If added to the major projects list, they would have a positive effect on the overall equity balance.</p> <p>The TSP's financial chapter was adopted in 2016 as part of periodic review. Since its adoption, there has been changes to the TSDC rates, the passage of a cannabis tax, new revenues from Build Portland, additional funding from Fixing our Streets, and state funding from HB 2017. During the next update of the TSP, which will necessitate changing the planning horizon beyond 2035, the financial chapter will be updated to reflect these changes as well as possible changes resulting from the renewal of Fixing our Streets, regional investment measure, and the reauthorization of the federal highway bill.</p> <p>For this Proposed Draft update, we will propose to add new projects to the unconstrained list. An update to the TSP finance chapter will take place during the next update to the TSP and these projects will be part of the evaluation of an updated constrained list at that</p>
--	--

<p>I live on SW 42 above the steps that connect 42nd Ave to Garden Home Rd. (Trail 7) I understand that improvements are being considered for GHR.</p> <p>As usual, bike access is given a high priority by city planners but has little to do with how neighborhood residents use Trail 7 and GHR to access the park or Village. Lots of families walk this route but there are few bikes. So why improve bike lanes and not sidewalks? That's a waste of my tax dollars.</p> <p>Speed bumps are needed to slow traffic which is generally dangerous and way to fast, especially with people walking along the unimproved GHR roadside. Mothers with strollers are forced into the road to avoid the eroded roadside while cars wiz by at 35-40 mph.</p> <p>It's an easy fix if the city planners would get their priorities in line with actual use. Please address these hazards before another hit and run happens in our neighborhood.</p>	<p>Tommy G.</p>	<p>time.</p> <p>The TSP has an existing project to provide pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements along Garden Home Rd. For the TSP Discussion Draft, this project was proposed to be broken into three segments with all three segments including pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements as recommended in Southwest in Motion.</p> <p>With the postponement on Southwest in Motion's city council hearing, the Proposed Draft will not include the 4 new projects and 9 amended projects that are recommended for the TSP in Southwest in Motion. If city council recommends these projects and project amendments as part of the adoption of Southwest in Motion, PBOT will consider adding them in a future TSP update.</p>
<p>Reflect all SWIM Projects >500K in TSP Project List. As noted above, the project list in the TSP should reflect all of the projects in SWIM over 500K (assuming that is the cut-off point). For those Tier 1 & 2 SWIM projects that currently appear in the TSP, their descriptions should be modified to include any refinement provided in SWIM.</p>	<p>Keith L.</p>	<p>The TSP Major Projects list includes projects that meet city-wide and system-wide criteria for equity, safety, neighborhood access, economic benefit, health, climate, cost effectiveness, and community support. Not all projects above \$500,000 that are identified through plans such as Southwest in Motion are on the TSP projects list. This does not preclude the project from being built in the future.</p>

		<p>With the postponement on Southwest in Motion's city council hearing, the Proposed Draft will not include recommendation for the TSP in Southwest in Motion. If city council recommends these projects and project amendments as part of the adoption of Southwest in Motion, PBOT will consider adding them in a future TSP update.</p>
<p>Reflect SWIM Projects <500K in the TSP. While I understand the difficulty in listing all potential projects under 500K in the TSP, the plan should acknowledge they exist, and in the case of refinement plans like SWIM, they are identified and described in significant detail. The TSP should explain how these small programmatic projects will be funded and built.</p>	<p>Keith L.</p>	<p>The TSP Major Projects List includes 10 programs (i.e. bike network completion, pedestrian network completion) for small capital projects. The programs maintain reference lists of projects. Plans such as Southwest in Motion help to identify these projects.</p>
<p>I mentioned last week that some of the cost estimates in the TSP and SWIM are obviously way off. Examples would include \$2 million for bike lanes and sidewalk on SW Vermont from 52nd to the city limit (TSP), and 550K to complete SW Sunset Blvd. from Capitol Hwy. to Dosch. These are distracting, misleading, and perhaps worst of all, they diminish the perceived credibility of the plans.</p>	<p>Keith L.</p>	<p>Many of the cost estimates for TSP projects are planning level estimates. As projects develop, cost estimates become clearer; sometimes they increase and sometimes they decrease. The proposed amendments to existing projects in this update are an example of this.</p>
<p>I checked the project list with SWIM and was a bit surprised that this TSP draft lists some FC 1-10, some FC 11-20, and others not FC. The SWIM Stakeholder Working Group did not have that level of detail in our review (or at least I don't remember anything more than "tier 1" and "tier 2"). I need to take a closer look at SWIM since it seems to me that more projects were in SWIM than I see in this TSP update.</p>	<p>Marianne F.</p>	<p>The TSP Discussion Draft included the projects that were recommended to be added to the major projects list in Southwest in Motion (Appendix C). The projects were evaluated using the same criteria that were used as part of the previous development of the TSP major projects list. The criteria are equity, safety, neighborhood</p>

		<p>access, economic benefit, health, climate, cost effectiveness, and community support. The scores from this evaluation were compared to the existing project list as an input to determine project timeline.</p> <p>With the postponement on Southwest in Motion's city council hearing, the Proposed Draft will not include the 4 new projects and 9 amended projects that are recommended for the TSP in Southwest in Motion. If city council recommends these projects and project amendments as part of the adoption of Southwest in Motion, PBOT will consider adding them in a future TSP update.</p>
<p>One key project that is missing is SW 55/SW Pasadena from Taylors Ferry to SW 61st, which could be phased into three segments. SW 55th got dropped from the last update of the TSP because of the bike classification (a technical glitch in my opinion) and it is a key street in our neighborhood that needs to be safe for people walking, biking and driving to and from transit, parks and schools.</p>	<p>Marianne F.</p>	<p>For this update, we are only proposing to add new projects that have been recommended from adopted plans. The project you are proposing if not part of an adopted plan.</p>
<p>A key project that is missing, but is described in SWIM, is Project 90104, the Barbur Demonstration Project. PBOT changed the original Barbur Blvd project into four discrete projects and at least two of them (SW 26th and SW 24th) will likely cost more than \$500,000 and qualify as a "major project". Southwest in Motion Appendix C page C-2 says to remove this because the funding has been re-allocated to four other projects. I feel very strongly that there is a hierarchy of improvements needed among these four projects (SWNI letter to Commissioner Dan Saltzman dated November 13, 2017, attached), and if the SW 26 improvements needs the entire grant amount, then do it right, and keep the other three projects in the TSP for future funding. Barbur Blvd improvements are still desperately needed, especially if the SW Corridor project is not constructed, so this</p>	<p>Marianne F.</p>	<p>We are not proposing to remove Project 90104 from the TSP. This project, and all others, will be evaluated for revisions or removal as part of the next major TSP update.</p>

<p>project (TSP 90104) should not be removed from the TSP.</p>		
<p>There were other projects in SWIM recommended for removal pending completion, and I agree that it is premature to remove them from the TSP until they are actually constructed.</p>		