

November 17, 2009

Final report

MAKING THE GREATEST PLACE

Engagement strategies and community response

Final report

Appendix I: Online questionnaire results

November 17, 2009

Appendix I.i: Online questionnaire results, Regional Transportation Plan

Page: Linking transportation investments to our vision for the future

1. Given the goals of the RTP, is this the right balance of projects?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	12.3%	50
Mostly <input type="checkbox"/>	31.5%	128
Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/>	25.4%	103
No <input type="checkbox"/>	30.8%	125
answered question		406
skipped question		75

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

Response Count

 [Hide replies](#) 327

1. Increase # of transit and pedestrian projects

Fri, Oct 16, 2009 7:32 AM

2. It's important to me that real value for all citizens be a goal of any investment. I want things to be built that will be of a good design, good quality and will last a long time. I want investment to be made in regional trails and a better balance to be delivered for transportation improvement projects that will benefit pedestrians and cyclists...of all skill levels. I want strategic thinking to be the core of plans and investments and I want less money spent on projects that private business should be paying for. I am OK w/Ted Wheeler's idea on how to pay for a new Sellwood Bridge and I think the "city" bridges should be made a regional responsibility.

Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:12 PM

[<](#) [>](#)

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

- | | | |
|-----|--|---------------------------|
| 3. | Double the investment in bike facilities, specifically transit oriented bike roads. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:23 PM |
| 4. | Evaluate and sincerely the good of your neighborhoods! Economic or Lifestyle changes? Adjust accordingly. If the public is using bikes, parks, and public transportation more often, allocate those funds for preservation, restoration, and advancements in property and facility usage. If you want the public to utilize and "get behind" a system (public transportation), educate them on ease, cost efficiency, and benefits. Like any business, you have to tell the people what you are doing, why they care & how it benefits them. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:23 PM |
| 5. | Please improve current roadways and take little new lands for more roadways. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:36 PM |
| 6. | I feel that we should be working on moving autos in and out of the portland area more and better lanes.
ie hwy26,217 | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:20 PM |
| 7. | Return on dollars spent on transit is ridiculous. Tax dollars need to be spent where they are the most effective, for the benefit of the people who pay them! Transit should have to be self sustaining, the people who ride, should pay their way. One class of people (drivers - Truck and Car) should not have to pay for their own transportation needs, as well as the people on mass transits! | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 4:59 PM |
| 8. | The state really needs to look at fixing / widening existing highways or coming up with a solution for congestion in the Portland area. HWY 26 was done really well, but other areas really need improvement for future growth 217 is going to become a major problem in the next 5-10 years. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 4:22 PM |
| 9. | The percentages seem right on. As much as I'd like to see more urban transit and bike projects, I can understand that there are existing roads and other projects that need maintenance and construction that are expensive and take a lot of time. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 4:19 PM |
| 10. | Too much spending on bike facilities, should be limited to very high density areas only
Transit system is not viable unless it provides 24/7 service. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:39 PM |
| 11. | Use the model of the failed Mn. bridge replacement as a model of how to spend our 'Hwy,Rd. & bridge' \$\$'s. Minimize contractor fraud and waste by 'bonus and penalty' bid structure. limit truck weight and tire stud use to make \$\$'s go farther. Stop throwing our hard earned tax dollars away. If it was your project how would you pay for it. Be more responsible with our taxes. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:31 PM |

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

12. More should be spent on active transportation Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:25 PM

13. While it will be important to maintain our current transportation infrastructure, most new highway projects (and some local road projects) are unnecessary at the moment in history when transportation fuels become expensive and scarce, thus threatening the viability of the automobile, air travel and long-haul trucking. New roads is a very poor place to invest right now - a waste of precious infrastructure capital. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:14 PM

14. Widen bottlenecks first. Also, decide if a road is actually a highway or not. If it is, make it limited access and time the lights on it. Actually, time the lights everywhere. A computer system that can recognize problems and adjust light cycles accordingly would solve a lot of problems. Additionally, improve freeway interchanges. The interchange of the 99W and the 217 is absolutely ridiculous! Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:12 PM

15. More to transit and bicycle corridors. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:06 PM

16. More bicycle lanes and bike paths. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 2:19 PM

17. No more money to fish passage projects...lets wait until we how many salmon and steelhead return to the Sandy river system now that not a single barrier exists between or on that system since the final dam was removed a year ago. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 2:13 PM

Transit...get tough on the unions and force them to accept smaller fuel efficient buses to be used in non-peak hours...drivers to be paid less also for driving smaller buses...more people would maybe use them if the service was more frequent...serve the customers and not the drivers/unions.

More money for security of users of mass transit...customers first yes?

Figure out a way to keep road traffic and bicycles some mixing...they just do not mix...for the same reason that bicycles on sidewalks do not mix.

18. less highways, more transit and trails! Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:58 PM

19. I BELIEVE THAT THE TRANSPORTATION QUESTION HAS NOT BEEN OBJECTIVELY REVIEWED AND THAT CLEAR OBVIOUS SOLUTIONS HAVE BEEN NEGLECTED IN FAVOR OF POLITCALLY FAVORED ONES, ONES THAT COST MORE, NEGLECT ALTERNATIVE LAND USES. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:17 PM

20. Why promote 1 million more people. How about 250000 instead? Bike facilities should get more. Bike lanes and pedestrian lanes should get top priority. Not Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:16 PM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

polluting our streams and topsoil should be top goal in all of these projects. If you plan for safer, decent bike lanes then people will bike way more. Go to Eugene or examples. Bridges need to be designed for Bicyclists and Pedestrians as a priority.

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| <p>21. As we appear to be leaving the era of cheap energy and predictably cheap gas, it seems the current mix will lead to significant stranded assets All road planning should prioritize an interconnected system of complete streets that give people choices in how they travel rather than a system that funnels cars into one huge roadway that is bound to become congested and create toxic air hot spots..</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 12:50 PM</p> |
| <p>22. The issue for me is that these seem to be transportation projects in a void, without the corresponding links to where people are now and where they need to go. For the last 20 year and more, the north-south connectors in mass transit have been almost non-existant. So, you have out-of-direction travel if you take transit. It becomes much easier to take your car.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 12:18 PM</p> |
| <p>23. I believe we need to get away from the automobile society. By improving highways we only invite more folks on it.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 11:34 AM</p> |
| <p>24. Freight is critical for our long term viability as a region and needs expanded emphasis. I agree that transit improvements are needed particularly around improving high speed networks, the current max infrastructure is still too slow.elevated rail or some other way to get it out of the traffic flow and reduce the number of stops. Improved Bike Facilities is good but 1 billion dollars is a lot of bike lanes. Mixed use Trails expansion seems like a better use of money than sidewalks for moving people around.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 11:29 AM</p> |
| <p>25. Less bike facilities and less transit. More highways. More smart traffic lights. Bike facilities sound great in summer but we have six months of cold and rain. Also there are way too many bicyclists who will not obey traffic laws.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 11:12 AM</p> |
| <p>26. It should be obvious to all by now that the transit component needs more support.Recent cuts in bus service, particularly severe in Washington County, have been damaging. We need a "rainy day fund" to prevent such cutbacks in times of recession.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 11:01 AM</p> |
| <p>27. Need smaller buses to run thru neighborhoods to help move people to light rail. Need more secure parking at transit centers. Trails off main roads are a good way to get people to walk more.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:02 AM</p> |

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

28. We should decrease the amount for freight. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:56 AM

29. People of the Portland metro area vote with their automobiles. The vast majority of tax dollars come from people that deal with Portland's ridiculous traffic. Thus those tax dollars need to go towards roads, bridges and most importantly highways. People who ride bikes aren't taxed at all and nor does the city receive much tax revenue from those that ride the bus or max. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:23 AM

30. Transit: Oregon let what is now it's biggest employer build a low height Aloha facility at a distant point from downtown Portland where cow ranches and farms were across the street known as TV Highway. If Intel wanted to grow, why didn't Oregon have them build additional height/stories/floors to be used later? Because Intel uses commute reduction programs and compares its success to other businesses with similar state allowances/permissions is success where it needs to be for Oregon's sense of being? Permission for that Aloha location caused extreme traffic across the western region in one linear angle on main streets (Murray Blvd) that were not due north and south. This permitted a strong draw for increasing commuter traffic and the length of those traffic commutes. Then Oregon let them build in Hillsboro at another geometric and distant point from downtown again where there were farms in the immediate area. Intel benefits with types of reduced taxes claimed as a wash when considering employment. This is compounded with people working at Intel but preferring to live in Camus/Vancouver, etc. without paying Oregon DMV fees. Now in 2009 and in previous years Metro "claims" expansion in transit and bus service is required while some people running for Metro executive positions are backed by developers and city government entities interested in generating tax dollars by increasing home development fees/business revenues. Is the horse in the back of the cart? Now your transit brief claims bus service is desired. Oregon let developers build one of the largest home developments in the state now called Forest Heights. There is not one standard transit bus leaving/arriving in Forest Height to and from even the latest Intel facility/facilities in Hillsboro, Ronler Acres or Jones Farm. Intel claim of commute reduction shuttles to max have long ago been reduced to individual campuses. Oregon let developers build Forest Heights with one main exit to the south and that exit was at the south east corner of the development. Its exit streets are still two lane roads with houses along Cornell and Miller. No sidewalk extends from Cornell and Miller down the length of Miller Road. It is only at Miller Road and SW Barnes Road where a bus stop exists. Walking along this road, built without a berm, is dangerous and has been for how many years? Must expansion be your usual answer? Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:23 AM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

31. More money on Highways and less on mass transit Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:20 AM

32. Due to our climate. 1st emphasis should be on facilities that can run in all weather. mass Transit #1. Bridges that are overdue for replacement. Local streets that can take some of the transportation load. then sidewalks, bike paths and trails. Work then play. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:18 AM

33. Metro should concentrate on improving existing roads, highways, bridges, and mass transit rather than adding new access roads through current rural, agricultural and wetland areas. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:12 AM

34. Public transit is not a practical option for most Oregonians and will not be a practical option for as far into the future as I can see. So why we dump billions into Max trains is beyond understanding. You claim it's good for the environment, but here's a question: How many years of transporting small numbers of people on these trains will it take to off-set the months of heavy equipment running? It's totally impractical from every angle. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:08 AM

We need to expand highway bottle necks. We need to clarify whether cyclists must follow the rules of the road or rules of pedestrians before we invest in bike lanes. As things are, cyclists weave through traffic dangerously. If they want to share the road, maybe they should carry state registration?

35. Transit spending should be reduced to 3 billion and 2 billion should be added to highways and 1 billion to roads. Bikes and sidewalks should be reduced by 1/2 billion with 1/2 billion added to roads and bridges. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:44 AM

36. Every opportunity to improve bike, pedestrian and transit access (especially bus) should be emphasized over more road building. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:39 AM

37. It would be good to see a comparison with funding recommendations in earlier plans. Hopefully this puts more funding toward components of a more integrated transportation strategy, linking on-road and off-road ped/bike paths with transit and auto, etc. There should also be an opportunity to use regional monies for city street improvements (not just arterials) within the regional centers and town centers so they can become the hubs they are intended to be. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:35 AM

38. Various transportation reports indicate that widening existing highways actually encourage additional usage, leading to more, not less, congestion and bottlenecks. I believe that while the existing highways should be maintained and efficiencies made, widening shouldn't be where the dollars be allocated. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:34 AM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

- | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------------|
| 39. | I do think that highways needs to be widened, maybe even more built. Less on transit. Or more busses, less with max. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:04 AM |
| 40. | It should now be obvious to all that TriMet needs a bit more funding. Transit shoud receive \$10 million, obtained by small pro-rata decrements from each item funded at over \$100 K in the above proposal. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 7:44 AM |
| 41. | Transit is asking to much when there are so many areas of concern among so many | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:58 AM |
| 42. | Greater emphasis should be placed on improving and expanding public/alternative transit infrastructure. More than half of the planned budget is devoted to maintaining or improving automobile-based infrastructure. While we must invest in roads and highways to some extent, no amount of roadwork will relieve congestion if we do not provide viable alternatives to the automobile (particularly if we expect a million more drivers on the roads in coming years). | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:54 AM |
| 43. | The I5 to 99w bypass northern route should NOT be done. A southern route at the south end of Tualatin/northen Willsonville needs to be built and make Tualatin-Sherwoor road 2 lanes EACH way from I5 to 99W. This bypass should have been built long ago but due to idiots in the planning of the project and bribes/payoffs this project is STILL a three ring circus. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:52 AM |
| 44. | Less for tansit and no money for bikes. I -5 bridge is very important | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:20 AM |
| 45. | Light rail is a waste of money and brings trouble to neighborhoods that didn't want it in the first place. You can't divert trains and the the potential methods of increasing ridership aren't always in the commuter's intrest. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:06 AM |
| 46. | I don't see any mention of rail transit for people, only freight. We need alternative travel methods that do not include adding new roads. I'm against adding new roads and disrupting communities. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:04 AM |
| 47. | Less highways, more bike facilities and sidewalks. Outer SE Portland is really difficult to bike around because so many streets are disconnected and the majority lack sidewalks. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:53 AM |
| 48. | the use of dollars is significantly misappropriated. STOP FUNDING RAIL. the dollars are much better used on bus service. Look at the math. Bus service is significantly moe efficient than rail. IF Metro would increase the number of buses, the area of bus coverage and increase the frequency of bus trips, ridership will increase significantly. The new bicycle lane plan is beyond | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:24 AM |

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

absurd. It needs to be scrapped immediately. STOP FUNDING RAIL, it is a waste of tax payer money that would achieve so much more in any other category.

49. Road maintenance in potholes and bridge repair is necessary along with sidewalks to get to transit from the neighborhoods. Max should be expanded to Tigard, Lake Oswego, West Linn Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:14 AM

50. Given the climate crisis and the status of world fossil-fuel supplies, the region needs to further shift priorities towards transit of all types, development patterns that reduce the amount of travel, and increased rail (freight and passenger). Wed, Oct 14, 2009 7:19 PM

51. Widening highways have a negative impact on poor neighborhoods as existing highways and freeways are located through poor neighborhoods have often include people of color. I believe an emphasis (increased funding) on bike and public transportation is a necessity. Focusing on improved, safe and well marked bike and pubic transportation from communities like Vancouver, Gresham, Clackamas and Beaverton will greatly reduce local traffic leaving room for trucks along I-5 and 84. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 6:39 PM

52. I am opposed to light rail in the Portland to Gresham corridor in Tier 1. Gresham does not need another light rail line to add more crime, more low income housing, and more apartments typically encouraged along light rail lines. Increased bus service does not adversely affect an existing neighborhood and is much more economically feasible and easy to modify based off of change of ridership. Light rail is not worth the tax dollars spent to modify roads in existing populated areas. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 6:34 PM

53. Place more focus and resources on TOD projects that can reduce residents' dependency on automobiles. Also increase investment on bike/ped projects, particularly in communities that are currently underserved with bike/ped infrastructure. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 6:06 PM

54. Roads and Bridges- We need to emphasize the upgrade of roads and bridges, particularly in SW Portland where we currently have roads and bridges that are not currently maintained or improved. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 4:47 PM

Bikes and Sidewalks, in SW Portland, bike lanes and sidewalks are not connected adequately to provide a safe passage and to make our community walkable and bikeable, especially along the Barbur Blvd. corridor.

< 1 _____ >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

Transit is currently inadequate from SW to Downtown and from SW to outer SW/ Tigard/ Sherwood. I would love to ride my bike to work and use alternative forms of transit, but the road conditions, lack of safe, contiguous bike lanes, and lack of frequent service prevent me from doing so. I would love to see light rail along Barbur Blvd.

We need to invest in bringing the SW Portland neighborhood infrastructure up to par with the rest of the city before we begin any additional projects elsewhere. Especially with the predicted growth in the region, we need to find ways of accommodating it by investing in adequate infrastructure (sidewalks, paved streets, bike lanes, and transport).

-
- 55.** Although putting aside large sums for highways roads and bridges is sensible as wear'n'tear occurs and regular maintenance is necessary, but increasing the funds that go towards promoting biking, walking, public transit is more viable option. Directing funds towards bike lines and paths, sidewalks in areas outskirts of the heart of the city and the major neighbourhood is imperative and funds should be directed that way. I bike on Columbia everyday and have to deal with very dangerous roads without bike paths or even a sidewalk with semi's passing by. So, my hope is with these funds you hope to build the outskirts of the city with safe bike paths, sidewalks, and more accessibility with transit for folks who can't afford to live in the heart of the city or the high cost neighbourhoods. Also, direct more funds to the tracks that Amtrak uses to promote the train instead of driving. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 4:07 PM
-
- 56.** 64% of public transportation money is spent on projects that only 3% of use (bus routes, lightrail, bike lanes, etc). Please spend the money where it benefits the biggest percentage of population. We're a country built around the car. Skip the politically correct posture of the green movement. Put the money where it's most beneficial to the most people. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 3:45 PM
-
- 57.** I am unsure how 32% to transit and 5% to sidewalks will help your goal of "Promote reliable, efficient movement of freight, goods and services". I like sidewalks and transit but the real quality of life is how much money and jobs there are. We need to encourage bussiness to locate here. Think more jobs how can we do that? Wed, Oct 14, 2009 3:22 PM
-
- 58.** I think there needs to be more investment in Transit. Bike lanes, sidewalks, and trails are another top priority and must be invested in heavily. However I think Transit also needs to be emphasized more especially if Portland is to meet its Wed, Oct 14, 2009 3:15 PM

< 1 _____ >

250 responses per page

answered question **327**

skipped question **154**

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

Climate Action Plan and reductions in vehicle miles traveled is going to occur. A strong, easily accessible good Transit system is the best way to get people to lessen their dependence on a personal car. Road expansions will only get congested at a later time and you are just adding to air pollution and going backwards in terms of climate change. In terms of road infrastructure, expansions and huge mega roads should not be the emphasis. Road planning should prioritize an interconnected system of complete streets so people have more choices and more toxic air hot spots are not created.

<p>59. Less money on roads, bridges and highways. More money on transit, sidewalks and bike facilities, and regional trails.</p>	<p>Wed, Oct 14, 2009 1:37 PM</p>
<p>60. The region should focus more of it's efforts on sustainable transportation modes: rail, transit, bikeways and sidewalks. We should not be spending a quarter of our transportation budget to make roads wider and inviting more VMT's, more greenhouse gas emissions and more sprawl.</p>	<p>Wed, Oct 14, 2009 1:24 PM</p>
<p>61. Is TSMO amount enough</p>	<p>Wed, Oct 14, 2009 12:35 PM</p>
<p>62. Less on transit and more on highways then roads</p>	<p>Wed, Oct 14, 2009 12:22 PM</p>
<p>63. Expanding transit services helps keep local money at home , strengthening the local economy. Dependency on roads/highways results in shift of wealth to petroleum producing areas, weakening our local economy.</p>	<p>Wed, Oct 14, 2009 12:04 PM</p>
<p>64. I think we need to focus more funds on bicycle and transit projects. We need to begin to prioritize non-automobile transportation, and with such a large amount of the budget devoted to roads and highways, we aren't going to successfully address climate goals. I understand the importance of moving freight through the region, so why can't the focus be put on improving freight, rather than roadways in general? At some point (like right now!), single occupancy vehicle trips will have to be reduced, and I wish the RTP investment strategy would reflect a prioritization away from infrastructure that encourages people to drive.</p>	<p>Wed, Oct 14, 2009 11:22 AM</p>
<p>65. Need to increase the funding for Highways to reduce congestion (reduces greenhouse gases, brake pad releases...), reduce transit expenditure.</p>	<p>Wed, Oct 14, 2009 10:47 AM</p>
<p>66. Sidewalks, bike facilities, freight, TOD, TSMO, Transit, and Regional Trails, should be much higher percentages and highways and roads should be decreased. Bridges should be separate and remain the same or increased for safety and multimodal use of all bridges.</p>	<p>Wed, Oct 14, 2009 10:27 AM</p>

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

67. More bike lane and sidewalk investment! Living in Hillsboro, I can attest to the fact that it is dangerous to bike or walk in many parts of the city, even the more urbanized (which is really to say suburbanized) areas. If spending prioritizes cars and roads, so will residents. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:50 AM

68. There needs to be more in the way of separate routes and options for bicycle-pedestrian traffic, where routes are well buffered from vehicular traffic. Right now, the bikeways on the right side of existing roadways are confusing and dangerous, especially on arterials and other busy roadways. Autos can begin a right hand turn without the driver being able to see a bicyclist coming fast from somewhere behind them on their right, and the bicyclist whips by on the right without waiting for the automobile turn to be completed, or even noticing that someone's turn signal was on, which means a crash or near miss. I also see a lot of people riding bikes on the sidewalk. This would be preferable for young riders or inexperienced riders out for a short trip, but current sidewalk standards are way too narrow to allow this. Sidewalks should be wide enough to allow for use by bicycles, scooters, skateboards, motorized wheelchairs, and families walking together with dogs and strollers. There needs to be more attention to creation of specific ped/bikeway streets and alternative routes from neighborhoods to primary destinations such as schools, parks, libraries, and retail businesses. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:26 AM

It also ought to be possible to go to Mt. Hood Community College by light rail without having to transfer to a bus. The light rail system ought to connect the downtown business and government portions of the cities of Gresham, Troutdale, Fairview, Wood Village, and, possibly, Sandy.

69. We can keep building roads and freeways. But it won't reduce traffic. It won't even be a drop in the bucket. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 8:41 AM

Instead, I'd like to see a larger investment in freight, regional trails (which could bring in tourism), and bike & pedestrian facilities (which also could bring in tourism). We know that freight is badly provided for, and is of the utmost importance. We know that people want to get out of their cars if there are safe and reasonable provisions in the way of public transit, bike facilities, and walkways.

70. Reduce highway dollars and allocate funds to trains and mass transit. The need for roads and repair would be decreased if more truck cargo went by train. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 8:28 AM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question **327**

skipped question **154**

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

71. The weight in terms of cost toward transit reflects an effort to build your way, with rail, out of significant operating cost related to bus transit. It is a reasonable strategy if you actually can increase the density near the rail lines to support the that system but your battling against market choice and internal infrastructure deficiencies that at this time don't support the density. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 6:57 AM

72. More on transit proper and less on things like 2000 dollar trash cans Tue, Oct 13, 2009 9:12 PM

73. Maintaining and repairing existing roads and bridges is prudent, but building more large roadways, as in the proposed I-5 5 lane connector, is not a good nor green use of taxpayer dollars. That money should be spent augmenting our transit system, so we can be a model to other cities. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:58 PM
Improving the rail systems is money well spent especially if it allows for less truck traffic and pollution.

74. More funding for bike/ped facilities is needed -- including more signage showing people where the trails and paths are and connecting people to the facilities that are available. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:54 PM

75. Help current agencies collaborate and conserve what we already have, and listen to people whom actually live in these area's and create and actual plan, 10/12/09 Metro Greatest Place-Request for representation concerning our neighborhood. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 7:43 PM
Contact info: Jan Sea {503} 296-5267
4050 SW 91st Avenue, Portland OR 97225
jansea_62@msn.com

1 comment:

We can appreciate all the work and thought required in planning for growth when considering the Urban Growth Boundary. But with what we have seen in our own neighborhood, the situation is grim and overwhelming questionable for human and wildlife health.

Metro Area:

1 Question:

Since my neighborhood is located in an Upland Wetland between two creeks and is important to migratory Birds and other wildlife-

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

How will we insure that the degradation and pollution will not mow over the living things here?

When Metro starts its transportation plan this .66 mile Ave needs representation and a plan that insures others are educated as to the importance that this area plays to the connecting areas waterways. This street is used as a service drive for highway 217 continually with little to no monitoring.

1 request:

Due to what has been observed and experienced here over the last ten years I would like to speak to a specialist or over seer in ecology or hydrology to ensure the maps reflect the resources that are still here. Also it would be great to speak with the Metro Councilor who represents us. Thank you.

- 76.** There is more to consider here than just "transportation." Some of the costs that are not included in these types of plans are: environmental and public health (air, water and noise pollution), and other quality of life factors such as living in a quiet, neighborhood-centric city where one can safely walk or bike wherever one wants and women can walk in their neighborhoods alone at night without fear of being raped. Yes, that is Portland.
- Being able to find a job in one's own city is another quality of life issue. Prioritizing highways and freeways encourages people to live far from where they work. For instance, why spend billions on the CRC mostly to give SW Washingtonians an easier commute to a job that an Oregonian would love to have. Oregon's unemployment rate exactly reflects the number of Washingtonians working here. I bike commute year round. When I am not feeling well I take the bus or Max. I have worked downtown for over seven years and have never once driven. I am for tolling (not minimally, either) the I-5 bridge now and for tolling cars going into downtown Portland.
- On the Eastern side of the state where there is freezing and thawing of the roads and no public transit, I support highway spending. I have lived in Eastern Washington and know that the roads on the cold sides of the states are much much worse with giant pot holes that can and do bend wheels (car wheels). Roads in the Metro area are fine. Drivers whine about them but I ride through pitted streets on a bicycle everyday. If anyone should whine.... In the Metro area I do not support more road spending because we have so many other transportation options and it is about time residents started using them. We should increase the spending on public transportation and instead of reducing services as Tri-Met has been doing, we should be increasing service and

Tue, Oct 13, 2009 6:30 PM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

teaching people how to use it. Most of the time, people have to be forced to get out of their comfort zone as when gas prices went up. Buses get stuck in traffic jams behind single-occupant vehicles and those SOVs should be tolled going into downtown and the Pearl District. I am in support of bridge repairs and for outlawing studded tires west of the Cascades.

I would also like to see a lot more money spent on Amtrak (if applicable) and I agree with the freight expenditures above. If we could seriously reduce truck freight, I would be delighted. By the way, I am 52-year old and not a bicycle messenger.

77. Less focus on highways and more on transit, walking, and biking. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 6:20 PM

78. Sidewalks separate from bikeways (lanes and paths) should be \$1 billion since transit investment won't work unless all transit streets have safe, continuous, ADA accessible, and attractive (ie with landscaping and protection from motor vehicles) sidewalks. And additional \$1 billion should be spent on bikeways until all streets have safe bike facilities and a complete off-street system of bikeways is completed region-wide. Transit should receive the same amount (or more) than roads and bridges. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 4:21 PM

79. Seems like the I5 - I99 corridor is being railroaded through in spite of public opposition. Need some more public input on this prior to moving forward. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 4:12 PM

80. The 2035 plan should be a plan to transition into the post-automobile era. There should be money in the plan for the removal of roads and reclamation of parking areas. The bike infrastructure should be balanced with funds supporting both serious riders who are attempting to do long distances (e.g. Sherwood to downtown Portland) efficiently and inviting infrastructure to encourage novice riders and families to return to biking. Suburban town centers should be redesigned to make biking and walking irresistible for short trips. Rail and other transit should be emphasized. The rail network should be restored to connect the entire Willamette Valley. Congestion on automobile routes should be embraced as an adjunct tool to urban planning as a means to encourage people to live sustainably close to where they work. Future modes of transportation should be active and sustainable. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 4:08 PM

81. Existing roads and bridges need to be enhanced and/or maintained before we invest such a large amount in bike and ped. The investment is disproportionate to need and use as currently identified. We should identify bike "zones" (i.e. dense, urban) where the infrastructure investment should be the highest priority but outside these zones other needs are more important. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 3:28 PM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

82. More emphases needs to be placed on additional transit, bicycle and walking. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 3:17 PM
 We need to reduce the dependence our area has on the automobile and put more emphasis on walking, bicycling and mass transit. Much of the expenditures are based on experiencing more population growth, but we have to realize that we can no longer do that - our region can not afford to continue growing we do not have the resources to do it. We have to pull back on our thinking that growth is the only option - it is not and we have to realize to think so is no longer an option we have to go with an option that is good for the planet not our pocket books.

83. less highway, more rail based freight. the funding amounts for these two sectors should be switched. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 3:14 PM

84. Removing fish barriers needs more funds.Salmon is important to Oregons economy. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 2:42 PM

85. Widening existing highways will only induce more commuter traffic and thus will not address freight bottlenecks, mitigate congestion, improve reliability for interstate and regional travel and increase access to industrial areas and intermodal facilities. It will however increase driving, exacerbate global warming and increase air pollution. More investment in public transport, especially for operation, will provide a better alternative for accomplishing these objectives. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 2:37 PM

86. Less money for highways and more money for transit and freight. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 1:59 PM

87. Not only do we need to accommodate the influx of one million more people in our region, we need to build and grow our regional infrastructure to focus on the LIVABILITY of the region at the same time. Our focus on roads to mainly accommodate automobiles is not the direction in which we need to develop in order to grow healthy, just, and strong communities. Cities in other regions all over the world have grown to become megacities (Tokyo, Seoul, Mexico City, Delhi, etc.), and there are megathemes that we can gain to study for our own case: we can follow typical growth patterns and become a gigantic car-centric smog city, or invest our time, money, and efforts into a different (and better) future. This may not follow the mainstream or popular ideology, but with the realities of climate change it is what you must do. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 1:54 PM

88. Percentage of total dollars spent on car infrastructure (highway/roads & bridges) is greater than 57% of the total budget. This is out of balance and out of touch with our future needs. More alternative modes, more choices not less. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 12:30 PM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

89. Our highway/freeway system is incomplete and outdated. We are one of the only metro areas of our size without a completed outer loop. The 205 was originally designed to be a loop and needs to be completed. It will take pressure off of the 217, 26 and Sylvan tunnel on the westside. Additionally a simple solution to the 217 is the removal of some of the on ramps and off ramps. There are too many in the stretch from Canyon to the 99, which is surprisingly where the jams occur.

Tue, Oct 13, 2009 12:20 PM

90. Improved freeways & regional arterials. Better bridges at Interstate Bridge & Boone Bridge. No more light rail, commuter rail, buses, or streetcars. Develop multi-modal industrial hubs where air freight, rail freight, and freeway access all intersect...this is the wave of the future.

Tue, Oct 13, 2009 12:10 PM

91. More should be given to transit, cycling and walking.

Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:48 AM

92. Allocate more for freight rail. The more we use existing rail lines, the fewer gas/diesel-using trucks are putting stress on our roads and making it less attractive to walk or bike next to these roads.

Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:34 AM

93. Highways implies throughput. You should concentrating on what will support the UBG philosophy the best in PDX. That would mean growing communities that can be supported within their bounds. Greater focus on transit, Existing Roads and bridges, TSMO, Sidewalks and Bike.

Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:22 AM

94. I support the recommendations on transportation funding made by COO Jordan.

Tue, Oct 13, 2009 10:59 AM

95. Funding should focus on transforming our transportation system to one that is more efficient, reduces environmental impact, reduces the need for pouring more money into repairs, and helps build communities.

Tue, Oct 13, 2009 10:44 AM

When it comes to roads and highways the policy should be "fix it first". We should prioritize maintaining current road and highway infrastructure over building more roads and more auto capacity that require even more maintenance.

96. There needs to be more emphasis placed on improving current infrastructure and improvement on freight movement to enable industrial areas to develop and increase our employment base. Get the traffic moving and reduces bottlenecks do not create more bottlenecks.

Tue, Oct 13, 2009 10:08 AM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

97. There should be more invested in Transit AND bikes and sidewalks, and less on roads and bridges. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 9:20 AM

98. Less to highways. Less to roads & bridges for creation of new streets for automobiles. More to bike facilities and sidewalks. More to transit. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:25 AM

99. Transit to take 1/3 of the money, thats crazy! These systems accomodate 1-2% of the population and you want to take 32% of the money, typical "portland politics". Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:12 AM

100. Not sure of the "bang for the buck" of one project v. another but assuming more can be done for biking with fewer dollars your amount dedicated to biking is hopefully adequate. Does High Speed rail factor into these numbers? Electric car facilities (ie charging stations)? Tue, Oct 13, 2009 7:57 AM

101. In my opinion, the State, Metro and the City of Portland should all shift investment emphatically away from roads and highways, then add tolls to fund highways, and re-orient public dollars toward funding urban and inter-city public transit and other "green" options like bicycles and sidewalks. And absolutely DO NOT spend another penny on the Columbia River Crossing. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 5:43 AM

102. You claim to want to do things differently, but most of your road projects are expansion projects. I've lived in LA and Las Vegas, where all they do is expand roads. Yet these places suffer from serious traffic congestion. How many times do we have to tell you that expanding roads will not solve the problem? You need to be serious about actually creating viable alternatives to driving. This means making up for the years of lopsided auto spending in order to create a safe and attractive network for pedestrians and cyclists, and to increase the efficiency of public transit. The CRC boondoggle needs to be reworked from scratch. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 11:20 PM

103. I would recommend that less funds get dedicated to highways, roads, and bridges (especially the CRC), and that we, as a region, work to better develop low-emission transportation alternatives (light rail, high speed rail, rapid transit, bike paths). As a more often than not automobile commuter, I think we should try to limit our promotion of driving by making the alternatives easy, or even easier if you consider factors like congestion. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 9:17 PM

104. Increase the allocations to mass transit and alternative transportation in the light of global climate change. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 9:07 PM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

105. The planned allocation of money should be weighted more heavily toward transit and bike/ped projects, especially in light of decades of disproportionate investment in highway and road projects. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:56 PM

106. We must invest heavily in transit, bike lanes, sidewalks and trails to give people choices in how they travel, reduce pollution and create opportunities for healthy and active living. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:51 PM

Project lists are still too focused on building and expanding roads.

Three quarters of all road projects are expansions. Even without the Columbia River Crossing, whose size dwarfs all other investments, two thirds of all road projects are expansions.

Most road expansions lead to increased global warming pollution, additional traffic, poor land use patterns, increased air toxics, and inequitable investment. They are also very expensive, leaving little funding for other types of projects, including bike lanes, sidewalks, trails, and system management.

Road planning should prioritize an interconnected system of complete streets that give people choices in how they travel rather than a system that funnels cars into one huge roadway that is bound to become congested and create toxic air hot spots.

The transportation system needs to address the climate crisis, as over 40% of global warming pollution in Oregon comes from driving. The current plan does not reduce global warming. We need to create choices in how people travel and locate housing near jobs to reduce the amount people need to drive.

The region should invest in projects that increase safety and dramatically reduce the number of traffic fatalities in our communities.

Jobs, public spaces, parks, and affordable housing should be near each other and close to transit, so people of all incomes and abilities would be able to get to work, access healthy food, and reach their destinations reliably and affordably.

Metro should require more information on whether the projects invest equitably. Our transportation system should benefit communities equitably to ensure that all communities have good access to work, school, shopping and recreation; help create vibrant public spaces, support good health; address the climate crisis; and protect farms, forests, and natural resources.

The Columbia River Crossing megabridge project should not be in the RTP.

The CRC is a massive freeway bridge/ interchange building effort that will increase driving, exacerbate the climate crisis, and worsen air quality in neighborhoods near I-5 and I-205.

The CRC would exacerbate current bottlenecks at the junction of I-5 and I-405

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

and I-5 at the Rose Quarter, forcing the consideration of additional freeway expansions in the heart of Portland.

The financial cost of the CRC is so high it diverts a massive amount of our limited transportation resources with huge negative impacts and without providing benefits that come close to its cost.

107. I want televisions, bathrooms, vending machines and coffee/snack bistros on every bus, train and max line. We can possibly generate revenue, if we enact a fee. We could sell a pre-paid/pre-loaded card that gives access to these additional amenities that the current transportation is lacking. It could generate jobs. We also need better/increased amounts of art on our buses, too. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:42 PM

108. i wanted to add to my original survey the following: The RTP should prohibit projects such as the Sunnybrook Extension in north Clackamas County. This project would adversely impact rare old growth oak woodlands, which is designated a special habitat of concern through Title 13. The Sunnybrook extension would also cut off an underserved community from an underutilized natural area, which would run directly against Metro's goals in the Nature in Neighborhood programs. The RTP must account for the pressure placed on natural areas when transportation improvements are proposed. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:20 PM

When cuts are needed to fund high-priority projects, cut projects like the Sunnybrook extension.

109. i hope in 2035 we have a better plan than widening roads and mitigating congestion. when will it end? just keep building wider roads in your vision of never ending population growth? we should be smarter than that. i bet in 2035 we will not all still be commuting in our single occupancy vehicles. if you project the 'continuous road building' model out into the future we will just have giant asphalt strips, not communities. enough! Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:08 PM

110. There should be more emphasis on mass transit. It's okay to repair current hwys and bridges but new highways should not be developed Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:02 PM

111. I believe you need to adjust the numbers a bit to allow for more bike lanes and trails. Walking paths, or sidewalks are needed in many places as well. I think more and more people will be taking alternative forms of transport in the (near) future. Mass transit is ESSENTIAL in a city like this, more money into that to make it EVEN better is a very good start. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:49 PM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question **327**

skipped question **154**

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

112. The plan is too focused on building and expanding roads. It needs to invest more in transit, bike lanes, sidewalks and trails to give people choices in how they travel, reduce pollution and create opportunities for healthy and active living. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:35 PM

113. Too much money wasted on projects like WES. Also too much money spent on bike facilities. I am strongly opposed to WES because of the huge subsidies it requires. I don't think that there is enough traffic relief in providing for more bike facilities. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:08 PM

114. Too much for rail- especially WES and rail upgrades. High speed rail projects could further ruin livability. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:07 PM

115. I'd vote for more for expanding transit options/coverage and getting water-borne freight on the Willamette again, with less for roads. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 6:56 PM

116. If there is going to be a great emphasis on expanding the high capacity transit system and making biking and walking more viable options for transportation within the region, and part of the goal for this plan is to do our part for global warming it seems silly to be putting so much money into roadway widening and the like. Oil is running out. It may be tough for the time being but big investments, like the CRC, will be bad investments for our future. The goal is got get people out of cars, not to make it easier for them to drive (getting people out of cars helps local businesses and neighborhoods become vibrant). If you build new roads people will use them and keep using them until they fill up and then you have to build more. The interesting thing about traffic is most of the time if a roadway is taken away the traffic does not spread into the neighborhood like most people think. In fact, most of it just disappears. Don't just take my word for it. Look it up. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 6:08 PM

117. It is imperative that affordable housing, land use and transportation be part of one cohesive plan. The above information totally ignores the impact of transportation system on access to affordable housing. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 5:38 PM

118. More financing should be considered for freight. This will weigh heavily in the Region's ability to attract and maintain employers and provide for a more stable economy. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:49 PM

119. Beav, Oregon 97005 Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:36 PM

RTP comment,

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

Our transportation system is used by car dealers to advertise on YOUR AND YOUR NEIGHBOR'S license plates. SEE the metal rectangle COVERING the State name on YOUR license plate. LOOK at the Crater Lake plate. Some advertising rectangles COVER all four-words on the Crater Lake plate: Oregon, Crater Lake and CaentennialL. Roads wear out when the pound of ADVERTISING moves.

You want funding for RTP? Let car dealers pay the postal value for YOU DELIVERING THEIR POUND OF ADVERTISING. That'd be \$4.95 per postal delivery of one-pound. Home to work, \$4.95. Work to job site, \$4.95. Job site to vendor, \$4.95. Etc. We may have money left over to pay for FREE college education for everyone. Consider, car dealers do get free advertising on your plate--right in the middle of your car--every day until you unSCREW it and put in recycle bin.

You pay to pack THEIR advertising TODAY. You'd think car dealers could find some way of saying THANK YOU. Has the car dealer who TATTOOs your plate THANKED YOU TODAY?

Population control: Hold your breath until the car dealer who is USING your LICENSE PLATE ART as a BILLBOARD visits your home and thanks you for consuming oxygen you can't buy on your tires that wear out against pavement that wears out and we won't tax ourselves enough to repair which makes guck that goes down the storm drain and noxious gas. Start holding breath after you get home. That way your rotting carcass won't smell up the neighborhood.

URBNUZD BUYACAR DEALER.

We're all in this alone, together

Zephyr Thoreau Moore

-
- 120.** More emphasis should be on transit. We already have enough roads. Light rail moves more people per square inch, requires less of a carbon footprint, is safer and less accident prone, healthier for those who use it, ie walk more, and preserves the beauty of our environment. Plus it is an economic boon, because everyone can afford it. It builds community. Cars on the other hand pollute, are dangerous, and going to be about as popular as the blacksmith was at one time when oil gets rarer and more expensive. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:15 PM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

121. Would like to see larger emphasis on bike & ped facilities and emphasis on rail for both freight and transit Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:13 PM

122. 5% of planned funding going towards biking/walking infrastructure projects is still abysmally unacceptable. The investment to outcome ratio for bike/sidewalk projects is much more feasible and productive than that for road/bridge improvements. Increasing the investment percentage for non-car related projects is a must for this area to live up to it's talk of being a leader in sustainability. Such disproportionate investments in car-related infrastructure will do little to improve our alternative-transportation goals, and next to nothing to improve our regions contributions to global climate change. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:54 PM

123. The proposed plan continues to prioritize road expansion at the expense of other modes of travel. This is not consonant with the goal of a sustainable transportation system that protects the environment and ensures community health. On the contrary, excessive road construction will deepen dependence on the automobile, increase pollution, and threaten the future of young people like myself, who face a future clouded by the mounting costs of global warming. To ensure a better future for the region, Metro must limit subsidies for highway expansion while boosting investments in bicycle facilities, pedestrian infrastructure, and comprehensive transit service. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:33 PM

124. We need healthy choices, with emphasis on creating bike boulevards, bike paths, bike lanes, walking systems, and other choices that will enable the region to DRIVE LESS and be more sustainable. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:11 PM

125. Freight and rail upgrades should come first, followed by transit, TOD, roads and bridges, bike facilities, regional trails, etc. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:06 PM

126. Too focused on building and expanding roads. More focus should be given to building and expanding alternate transportation routes that give users choices for lower-impact, less-polluting options. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:53 PM

127. Much more emphasis to rail, bikes, trails ... face it we need to think about decreasing traffic on roads and highways, and stop expanding them..... Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:50 PM

128. I am concerned about the high percentage on both pie charts of highways, roads and bridges. For a region that prides itself on being "green" and forward-thinking, this is way too much emphasis on cars. I realize that there will be more people and hence - more cars. I would much rather see a shifting of our system toward one in which car use is less needed, rather than just expanding the system to support the way people currently use it. If more people could Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:28 PM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

work, shop and play near where they live, there will be less need for more lanes on the freeway etc. I would much rather see a higher percentage of funding and projects going toward bikes, sidewalks, transit and freight. I have many concerns about the CRC, which I believe is part of this strategy. I live in NE Portland, and am concerned about the encouragement of more and more traffic going over the bridge. I am also worried about the safety of having the bike lanes isolated from car traffic, making bikers more vulnerable to violent crime on the bridge.

I would be very excited to see a project that relieved freight bottlenecks, as this seems to be one of the barriers to having an efficient passenger rail system (the Coast Starlight gets caught behind a freight train often!).

Thank you SO MUCH for the opportunity to comment! I know that there are many interests contacting you. My interest is for Portland to live up to our reputation as a green, forward-thinking and smart city that knows how to do urban planning equitably and creatively.

129. Continue to emphasize, reward and encourage people to get out of cars. Underfunded roads will perhaps help us re-think our travel priorities. Using the options for walking, biking, other types of non-road transit is the future. And, limiting our easy-as-pie travel habits. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:06 PM

130. Metro needs to place a greater investment in bike, pedestrian and transit infrastructure. This RTP still focuses too narrowly on unsustainable transportation infrastructure that does not move the region forward. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:05 PM

131. Too much for freeways! Do not widen any more freeways, it only leads to congestion, everyone knows that, especially the millions of us who have or will move here from California, lol! Thank you for the amount devoted to bicycles, that is really the way to go. If we are to meet our carbon reduction goals, this has got to be a big part of the way forward. Land use must be a bigger part of transportation planning -- let's try to remove people's need to drive so much. If they have jobs and shops in their own neighborhoods, they will stick closer to home. Down with the CRC!!! We could all have free transit for the next thousand years for the cost of the CRC. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:00 PM

132. I would like to see existing maintained and improved. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 11:34 AM

133. Possibly more \$\$ to existing roadways. I do not want to see new roadways or highways being built. Look to Europe to see how to best manage more Mon, Oct 12, 2009 11:30 AM

< 1 _____ >

250 responses per page

answered question **327**

skipped question **154**

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

cars/people on less roadways. Conserve farm land.

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| <p>134. The emphasis sounds reasonable. It would be good to have assurance the bike/sidewalk improvements under Roads and Bridges are incremental to the Bike Facilities and Sidewalks</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:55 AM</p> |
| <p>135. All transit dollars should be spent on roadways and maintenance. Wasting precious resources on limited value projects may make the polititions happy at our mobility's expense.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:24 AM</p> |
| <p>136. More streetcar usage in existing neighborhoods to further the development of mini town centers.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:11 AM</p> |
| <p>137. Any new projects should not encourage auto usage including road widening and intersection widening. American road standards especially suburban standards are too wide, consuming resources and promoting increase speeds. More funds should be spent on transit, bicycling, walking and TDM to reduce VMT, reduce carbon emissions and increase physical activity for healthier individuals.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:04 AM</p> |
| <p>138. I'm looking for more creative partnerships to provide high-speed train facilities along the Vancouver BC to Portland (and south) corridor as an alternative to driving. Yes, maintain the freeways, and get the new bridge across the Columbia, but give us the option of connecting to other large urban areas by rail. If I had the option of taking the train to Seattle for business, I would never drive/fly. Separating passenger rail from freight will benefit both.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 9:55 AM</p> |
| <p>139. More money should be spent on highways, less on HCT. Highway improvements to areas like Wilsonville, Tigard and Sherwood are more important than the extension of mass transit to those areas. Mass transit investments should be more focussed on moving people to and from employment centers around the Region and less on getting people to downtown Portland.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:18 AM</p> |
| <p>140. We need more money for roads.. There was a pledge by Governor Roberts to provide funds for 217 when the deleted the Westside Bypass from the transportation projects. It was proposed to be \$200 million. This money was never appropriated for the project.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:22 AM</p> |

Dick Buno, VP Pac Trust, pointed out the planning for jobs and land development was proposed with the Westside bypass being a lynch pin for the transportation strategy. Metro and the state did not provide an alternative while

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

growth continued. Now we have no money!! Metro under Mike Burton took the bypass off the regional plan and then added it back when it was obviously needed (Tualatin-Sherwood road was not designed to be an I-5 connector). Bottom line Metro has policies which are not in sync with the needs of a sustainable and growing community.

Too much has been spent on the belief that rail oriented mass transit is the end all and be all to responsible growth.

While I support and have advocated for rail transit (WES proposal) the reality is we cannot grow without fixing the mess we made by not being proactive with the development of additional capacity for cars and trucks (you can't separate them).

In my opinion the region is flat lined and we will experience little or no growth at the expense of our citizens.

On the good news side: I am fifth generation born and raised in the region. I am tired of the new age who are rude and selfish and have enough for me and mine. As long as I understand what I need to be done to protect what I have and help my children the rest is too late to fix!!

141. More to maintain our current infrastructure. The \$6.6 billion indicates for "roads & bridges," although doesn't differentiate how much to each and one bridge repair alone could use 50% of the costs. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 6:48 AM

142. In general, I support projects and investments that will create infrastructure in Southwest Portland, a quadrant of the city that has been drastically overlooked in planning for the population growth. We have inadequate roadways, sidewalks, bike lanes, and a north-south corridor for high capacity transit. Sun, Oct 11, 2009 12:41 PM

For Mobility Corridor Projects:

1. I recommend that the I-5/99W mobility corridor be a high priority for a Corridor Refinement Plan. Further study is needed to improve mobility along I-5 and Barbur, complete significant gaps in the bicycle and pedestrian facilities on Barbur, construct needed stormwater facilities on Barbur, and support town centers and commercial nodes. This study is especially needed to evaluate how the selection of Barbur as a near-term priority for high-capacity transit will allow Barbur to accommodate all modes of transportation (transit, bicycles, pedestrians and motor vehicles).

< 1 _____ >

250 responses per page

answered question **327**

skipped question **154**

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

The project list includes several projects on Barbur and I-5 that will help accomplish these goals.

For Community Building Projects:

2. The plan discusses transit improvements needed in the region, but over the last few years, TriMet has been disinvesting in transit service in Southwest Portland. In order to accommodate growth in centers and corridors we will need better bus service within our community.

3. The plan discusses the need for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and a vision for a well-connected network of "complete streets" that accommodate bicycles, pedestrians and transit as well as motor vehicles. In Southwest Portland, there are SIGNIFICANT gaps in the bicycle, pedestrian and transit network, and the project list falls far short of the projects needed to meet this vision. I recommend that the Regional Transportation Plan develop a network for SW Portland that could include, at a minimum:

1. east-west routes: Hamilton, Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway, Vermont, Multnomah Blvd., Taylors Ferry Road

2. north-south routes: Barbur Blvd., Terwilliger/Boones Ferry Road, 30th/Dosch, Capitol Highway, 45th,

4. I applaud Metro for developing proposed performance measures to evaluate the effectiveness of these planning efforts, but there are many problems with the details. Living within 1/2 mile of a bus stop is a good performance measure but it should only be measured if people have ADA-compliant pedestrian facilities to enable you to get to that bus stop safely. The presence of a bus line is a good performance measure but it should only be counted if includes service outside of commuter hours. Most importantly, the proposed regional goals are based on regional averages and I believe there should be some minimum target level for alternative modes for all areas of the region (in other words, SW Portland's bicycle network is not platinum status but bike path investments made in the flatter sections of the region do raise the averages; new light rail ridership raises average ridership even though we have seen disinvestments in bus transit service in our area).

5. The draft plan describes an "investment strategy" in Chapter 3 that illustrates that more than half of the projects and half the costs are dedicated to

< 1 _____ >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

throughways, roads and bridges, and freight, with relatively little invested in trails or bicycle and pedestrian facilities. If the region is serious about meeting objectives for reducing vehicle miles traveled or greenhouse gas emissions, then it must seriously invest in the infrastructure needed to allow people, goods and services to reach destinations without relying on motor vehicles.

Here are some specific comments on the projects:

I support the inclusion of bicycle and pedestrians improvements on Capitol Highway (projects #10189, 10272 and 10273).

Priorities for improvements to Barbur Blvd. are currently on the state list (projects #10283 and 10285) and I recommend that they be placed on the federal priority list. In addition, ODOT's proposal to improve several bridges on Barbur Blvd. (project #11324) is on the state list but includes improving some bridges that are proposed to be removed in the South Portland Improvements project #10235. I recommend that the Barbur Bridges project be phased in so the projects that are urgently needed to complete the unsafe gaps in the bicycle lane are on the federal priority list, because eliminating these gaps in the bicycle lane south of Naito Parkway does not conflict with the South Portland Improvements project.

I support the inclusion of the following projects on the federal list that support the RTP goals for centers and corridors: the SW Capitol Highway and SW Barbur Blvd. projects listed above.

143. Significantly reduce the amount going into bike facilities, and use the money hidden within the "Roads and Bridges" allocation to actually build or improve roads and bridges, not rebuild them just to add sidewalks and bike paths. Enough already with all of the money being spent on bikes! Sun, Oct 11, 2009 8:37 AM

144. Less funding in the roads and brudges category, increasing TSMO by at least 50%, adding funding for regional trails and substantially-improving the commercial/freight network. Much greater focus on congestion pricing arrangements and/or incentives, drawn from transit funding. Give first priority to major congestion points. Establish incentives for transit use. Use gas tax increases, rather than local taxes, to encourage usage of existing system. Sun, Oct 11, 2009 6:54 AM

145. I do not support any expansion of any rail based street level transit. As a bicyclist, I'd rather share the road with busses than with train tracks. So you Sun, Oct 11, 2009 1:15 AM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question **327**

skipped question **154**

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

can probably reduce or eliminate the \$6.2 billion for "high capacity transit" which I assume is Metro-speak for more railroads. What kind of bicycle facilities? I don't support additional cycle tracks or buffered bike lanes. I'd rather see the money spent fixing the gaps in the existing bicycle infrastructure, such as the gaps in the bike lanes on Barbur between Capitol and Multnomah Blvd., adding a bike lane to Garden Home Road between Oleson and Scholls Ferry, and most importantly, fixing crash corner also known as the intersection of Beaverton-Hillsdale/Oleson/Scholls.

- | | | |
|-------------|--|----------------------------|
| 146. | Less on highways. Only spend on maintaining current highway system and improvements only in the most critical sites where safety is of concern. | Sat, Oct 10, 2009 12:49 PM |
| 147. | Allocate more to freight mobility (expand freeways to industrial land) and less to other uses. | Sat, Oct 10, 2009 9:19 AM |
| 148. | More dollars to expand and repair roads. Reduce regional trails using any transportation dollars. Reduce the investment in light rail transit. Upgrade buses. | Sat, Oct 10, 2009 9:07 AM |
| 149. | I definitely support more transit and safe walking/biking routes. I am very happy to see fairly good support for these in the budget. Looks like a reasonable mix to me. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 5:57 PM |
| 150. | Need more emphasis for the road system | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 2:48 PM |
| 151. | I like the emphasis on transit, trails and sidewalks/bikes. Our population is aging, and many of our seniors will lose their ability to drive. Having convenient mass transit will help fill the gap. Having sidewalks and trails will enable everyone to preserve their mobility and get around without cars. I like the emphasis on roads and bridges too, much needed infrastructure. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 2:08 PM |
| 152. | We should focus less on widening highways to speed freight, and more on reducing passenger car trips to free up existing capacity for freight. Given how expensive new transit facilities can be, it makes more sense to focus on improving TOD areas and Land Use strategies that allow individuals to live, work, shop and play without needing an automobile for most trips. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:43 PM |
| 153. | Increase the allocation of funds for transit oriented development to a minimum of 5% to complement investments in transit. Reduce funding for interstate highway travel and expand funding to improve viability of high speed rail | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:02 PM |

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

154. Far too much money and time is being planned for future transit issues. Take 80% of the money you have designated for transit, and put that money into highway development and widening. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 12:39 PM

155. More money to build new roads to eliminate bottlenecks (HWY 26 to I5) and less to transit. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 12:16 PM

156. Metro should invest in strategies and projects that improve non-motorized transportation such as biking and walking and increases access to public transportation both in dense urban areas and to outlying areas. Infrastructure and policy should be developed to limit transportation of freight on highways and roads and instead focus it on rail or right of ways. Incentives should be created to decrease use of personal vehicles or at the least increases use of personal vehicles that are ecologically friendly. Road and bridges should be invested in to preserve safety but all efforts should be used to decrease transportation as usual (passenger vehicle) and instead expand the model which Portland is already noted for that being public transit and human power. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 12:12 PM

157. The proposal is bike and ped centric. Bike and ped commuting or commerce is relatively short range. Jobs may or not be reasonably accessible by walking or biking. Transit may or may not provide access to jobs in a reasonable time or at all throughout the region. The proposal spreads bike and ped spending into several different catagories; these costs should be aggregated. Costs do not comprehend the value of ROW used. Jobs are spread throughout the region and may or may not be close to home. This is a regional plan and should comprehend people moving efficiently throughout the region for jobs and commerce. This means providing for the use of personal vehicles whether they are gas or green powered. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:36 AM

Freight projects are expensive. Freight movement is important to jobs. The investment in freight is too low accross the modes. For instance, it is not clear how much of "Roads and Bridges" will actually apply to repairing and improving freight movement as opposed to bikes and peds.

It is not clear how you are addressing the needs of an aging population a higher percentage of which will be unable or unwilling to bike or walk long distances than today's population.

158. i think it's good....i'm not an expert. It does seem like there could be a few more dollars spent to make roadways and bridges safer for pedestrian and cycle traffic-inclusive of motor scooters and motorcycles. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:33 AM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question **327**

skipped question **154**

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

- | | | |
|------|---|---------------------------|
| 159. | Live in the real world and lay off the fantasies. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:30 AM |
| 160. | I would like great consideration to be give to enlarging roadways to allow bikes to have enough room to not feel confind in their lane. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:25 AM |
| 161. | Need more highways, roads and bridges | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:18 AM |
| 162. | Much less on transit which serves a tiny minority. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:14 AM |
| 163. | Spend less on bicycles and transit and more on roads & bridges. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:05 AM |
| 164. | The number of projects is largely misleading. The true nature of the balance of the projects is indicated by the dollar breakdown. This indicates too heavy a focus on roads and automotive transportation. More than 5% of trips are taken by bicycle or foot in the Portland area and this should only increase. Funding to support and encourage this should be expanded. The freight and general train investments are also underserved by this proposal. Industry and associated good-paying industrial jobs are served as well, if not better by rail improvements as opposed to yet more highways. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:03 AM |
| 165. | Sidewalks/trails and bike routes are significantly undervalued in your proposal. I would increase funding 500% given the current lack of non-motorized transportation options in our neighborhoods. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:02 AM |
| 166. | I feel that more focus should be placed on the safety of our bridges and the safety of the bike lanes into and around the city. As the city trys to encourage individuals to use other forms of transportation, it only makes sense to be proactive and upgrading old systems that are falling apart or are out dated. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:52 AM |
| 167. | More monetary support for bicycle projects. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:39 AM |
| 168. | Key to the future is vibrant transit system, more \$ there | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:36 AM |
| 169. | Spend the 6.2b allocated to Transit to Highways to relieve bottlenecks and move car and truck traffic better, reducing Transit to 4.5 b. review the Roads and Bridges funding for cost/benefit. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:34 AM |
| 170. | It would be nice if the pie chart split roads from bridges. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:31 AM |
| 171. | More dollars in roads and bridges, less in transit and bike facilities | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:26 AM |
| 172. | It's hard to offer meaningful, substantive comments on numbers without any context, but by and large, I support improvements to our existing infrastructure, v. new highways and bridges, and investment in bike and pedestrian corridors | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:26 AM |

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

and transit. Seeing large chunks of the pie devoted to bike, ped, and transit projects is great -- it would be great if they were to get even larger.

- | | | |
|------|---|---------------------------|
| 173. | The balance is probably right. I'd like to see more emphasis on improving connections to outlying areas, taking into account that Oregon's land use laws prevent sprawl that might otherwise be encouraged by building high-speed connections to the 99W and US 26 corridors from Portland's existing freeway system. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:25 AM |
| 174. | Reparation of existing bridges and roads is more important than creating new roads. Investing in transit can lower the traffic on highways, bridges and roads. | Thu, Oct 8, 2009 9:29 PM |
| 175. | We need the strongest possible emphasis on bike transit developments and maintaining existing infrastructure. Building new roads, especially in previously undeveloped areas, should be a low priority. The RTP should prohibit the expenditure of funds on proposals that would adversely effect special habitats of concern or other resources designated for protection through title 13. For example, the RTP should prohibit projects such as the Sunnybrook Extension in north Clackamas County. This project would adversely effect oak woodlands, a special habitat of concern. The project would also cut off a community that is underserved with natural areas from an underutilized natural area. The RTP should account for these contingencies in strong and unequivocal terms that protect natural areas and community access. | Thu, Oct 8, 2009 6:09 PM |
| 176. | Most of the money should be spent to widen existing highways and repair roads and bridges. Bike trails have a trivial impact on traffic, but cost a lot. Mass transit is useful, but only if it includes a north-south corridor that parallels Interstate 5. | Thu, Oct 8, 2009 9:40 AM |
| 177. | If we are serious about climate change and compact development, the proportion of funding going toward bicycle/ pedestrian/ trail / transit projects should be much higher. Roads and bridges, and highway improvements together should be ~40% or less. | Thu, Oct 8, 2009 8:40 AM |
| 178. | We should invest a lot more in demand management and far less in building highway capacity. Great places rarely to highlight automobiles. | Thu, Oct 8, 2009 8:25 AM |
| 179. | Transit, Trails and TOD should be given a higher priority with increased funding at the expense of highways, roads and bridges. | Thu, Oct 8, 2009 7:39 AM |
| 180. | Rail-based transit projects are clearly a very expensive option. Metro and Tri-Met should look at more flexible, Bus-based trolley systems used in the | Wed, Oct 7, 2009 8:57 PM |

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

United Kingdom and Europe. Portions of Principal Arterial roadways and State Highways could have dedicated Bus-based trolley lanes shared with High Occupancy Vehicles. The infrastructure costs are substantially less than fixed-rail systems.

181. Would like to see actual analysis of cost/benefit of increased dollars spent on transit. Outside of core areas, how much benefit does it have? Spending 2/3 as much as we do on highways, roads and bridges for transit and bike facilities seems a little off base Wed, Oct 7, 2009 4:02 PM

182. When looking at this, I'm assuming "Transit" refers to mass transit (busses, lightrail, and etc.)? What are the percentage of people who use each mode on the pie chart? Do 32% of the population use mass transit? That looks like a high percentage compared to what is being invested in highways, roads and bridges. Of course, it's difficult to have a good bus system without more investment in the roads, bridges and highways they use. It also worries me to only see 3% going to freight when it is the lifeline that carries the blood of our economy. Wed, Oct 7, 2009 1:22 PM

183. I think it is importnt to fill the gaps in the sidewalk system. This should be persued more agressively as it increases the safety of pedestrians including school children who use the system daily. Wed, Oct 7, 2009 12:26 PM

184. Double the amount for regional trails. This is a vital part of the regional bicycle system. Tue, Oct 6, 2009 7:41 PM

185. Portland can not pedal its way to prosperity or maintain a prosperous economy by continuing to promote bike trails and walking paths in disproportionate balance to freight and commuter mobility. Tue, Oct 6, 2009 4:10 PM

186. Less highways and roads, more rail transit, bikeways, and pedestrian improvements. Tue, Oct 6, 2009 4:05 PM

187. Need to emphasize the development of pedestrian & bike transportation routes. \$278 million for regional trails is not money to connect all of the regions communities with an adequate regional pathway system. Tue, Oct 6, 2009 3:59 PM

188. Limit new road construction to those needed to provide access to employment areas; focus on providing connections and filling gaps to existing road system especially filling bicycle and pedestrian facility gaps. Transit improvements should be equitably distributed throughout the region; look at ways to make connections to new Green Line especially in Clackamas Regional Center and Tue, Oct 6, 2009 2:29 PM

< 1 _____ >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

Industrial areas.

189. With the emphasis on sustainability, there needs to be more on bike facilities and trails and on Regional trails. Tue, Oct 6, 2009 12:29 PM

190. There needs to be a bigger share of dollars given to extending sidewalks where there currently are none, and for acquiring right of way for and building of bike paths to separate bicyclists from cars to ensure greater safety. Tue, Oct 6, 2009 11:39 AM

191. Please increase the investment (dollars) for pedestrian and bicycle improvements. An investment strategy of only 5% of dollars proposed is not enough. Walking and biking are part of the solution to reducing congestion and carbon emissions. It won't be possible to reduce the dependence on autos unless transportation strategy and spending gives greater equity to these alternate modes. Tue, Oct 6, 2009 10:33 AM

192. Spend LESS on transit. Spend less on bikes and sidewalks. Reduce the total number of "investments" so you don't choke the taxpayer or funding source. \$20 Billion for capital investments, just for transportation, is simply shocking, even if its spread out over 25 years. Study WHY people want to move here and how we can get these new arrivals to chip in their fair share of money. I can't blindly accept that a million people will be living in the Metro area by 2035. Don't accomodate them. We can't even replace the Interstate I-5 bridge for crying out loud, not to mention the Sellwood Bridge. Stick to the very basics and set your sights LOWER or we will all become refugees here! Mon, Oct 5, 2009 8:55 PM

193. I'm thinking you may want to adjust the numbers somewhat to delegate more money to public transportation such as buses, MAX, bike trails and sidewalk expansion. If you look to existing European communities which have been bursting at the seams for hundreds of years, you'll notice that despite a dense concentration of people in the urban and suburban areas, there are less cars on the roads, and less congestion overall. They use public transportation, walking and biking more than we do here. I think Oregonians would prefer to move towards that model rather than trying to cram in cars for the expected 1 million additional people over the next 30 years. If you build in this type of European infrasctructure in advance, it will keep things calmer, greener, and less polluted in the future. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 3:42 PM

194. The distribution for alternative travel modes is far better than in years past, but there is lots of catchup to do. Pedestrian facilities need to be complete to understand the potential to reduce pressure on arterial roads. Maintain existing Mon, Oct 5, 2009 3:41 PM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

road and bridges but let's catch up on other needs, particularly in the suburbs, before building new regional roads. (Local street, however, can be a help for connectivity of all modes.)

195. The entire question is based on a false premise. We simply cannot continue to grow at the rates projected for the next 20 years. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 2:53 PM

For one thing, there is not enough drinkable water, to say nothing of cheap, dense, portable energy.

Additionally, as we get larger and larger conglomerations of people, the burden of building and maintaining the necessary infrastructure takes up a larger and larger share of production - we have already exceeded our capacity to meet current needs. This will not get better over time.

Historically, people can travel about 1 hour each way from where they live to where they work. This has been true for at least the last 2,000 years. While there may be technology that can shorten the time it takes to travel through the region, between work and home, it becomes increasingly expensive (in money, resources and time) to provide that transportation. A gain, we have exceeded our capacity to do this.

What we need to do is develop equitable ways to build and maintain a healthy economy that is not based on endless growth.

196. I think the percentage of money devoted to freight movement should be increased a bit, perhaps to 7 or 8 percent of the total, and this amount should be taken equally from the 3 biggest "pots" of money. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 12:29 PM

197. Increase percentage to sidewalks and pedestrian facilities. Under investment for the last 50 years has left a large percentage of the metro area inaccessible for pedestrians. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 10:26 AM

198. Chains and studded tires should be banned to reduce maintenance costs of Highway and Roads. TSMO should be increased to provide planners and managers with accurate data on traffic patterns and increase opportunities for integration with other systems and departments (police, fire, medical, traffic reporting, real-time route management, transit frequency, etc etc). Freight should be increased to remove grade-level crossings at current and future high volume intersections. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 9:13 AM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question **327**

skipped question **154**

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

199. The investment strategy should be to maintain the existing transportation and upgrade the road system to improve mobility Mon, Oct 5, 2009 8:19 AM

200. I think more money needs to be put into mass transit. Roads and Bridges and parking need to be a priority. It is nice to address the bikers but way too much money is spent on a few. They cause congestion and bottlenecks in traffic. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 7:12 AM

201. I wonder how much money transit is still losing and what level of capacity is at most times. Maybe we could cut back there. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 5:12 AM
 I would like to see off the road bike trails so that riders are safe. I think the number of bike commuters would increase if there were separate paths. How many people have to die before we give up on the concept that bikes and cars can make nice and coexist? Why not use old train track networks for bike trails? I am not a biker but I drive the roads with speeds of 55mph and bikers going 15mph. It is dangerous for everyone but the bikers lose if there is a collision. It is also dangerous for bikers even on slower city streets.

202. More emphases on highways, roads and bridges. Think beyond the city. This is an area that depends heavily on automobile transportation. Therefore, the majority of funding should be directed towards improving the flow of auto and truck traffic. This would also address a significant portion of mass transportation issues, as improving traffic flow would also improve conditions for the busses, which are a far less expensive alternative than the light rail system. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 4:50 AM

203. \$164 million doesn't seem like enough for transit-oriented development or removal of barriers to fish passage. It seems that if we want more people to bike and walk to meet their basic needs we'll need to promote more development that is easily supported by transit, bikeways, and sidewalks. Further, I imagine that it is expensive to remove barriers to fish passage. Given the state of our environment, this needs to be a priority. Sun, Oct 4, 2009 6:47 PM

204. Transit money should be focused on improving and keeping existing options available before anything is spent to expand the transit system. Those of us who already live here deserve a higher priority. Sun, Oct 4, 2009 6:28 PM

205. it would be great to see Metro emphasize depaving areas that are no longer needed as paved areas. there are so many streets that could be depaved. there are huge wide streets which don't need to be so wide, would be great to see more area depaved, and less new pavement going in. i suspect that the car is going to take dip in use going forward, if we can recognize that, how Sun, Oct 4, 2009 4:07 PM

< 1 _____ >

250 responses per page

answered question **327**

skipped question **154**

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

about we discontinue building new roads, and decommission ones that we no longer need.

also, would be great for someone to travel to Europe and take some notes on how they do it in Amsterdam. now that's a city that understands biking! would love to see more money go towards bike-friendly development.

and, finally, more money for high-speed rail.

and a line between Portland and Hood River would be pretty neat.

206. There is much too much catering to movement of goods by truck. Much more investment in rail is needed for both people and goods, that will reduce the need to widen highways and bridges, and reduce carbon emissions. Sidewalks and bike lanes need more money, too

Sun, Oct 4, 2009 2:21 PM

207. I agree with Metro that there should be a balance between all modes of transportation. Emphasis should be on expanding alternative modes of transportation that do not include roads, with emphasis on light rail and bike lanes. However, the current road infrastructure should be maintained and, when possible, made more efficient. Expansion of highways should be a lower priority than mass transit.
More efficient movement of freight is critical to the economic growth of our region and also will reduce congestion on our highways.

Sun, Oct 4, 2009 12:33 PM

208. More emphasis on sidewalks and improved access to transit.
More emphasis on regional trails.
Greater subsidies of mass transit.

Sat, Oct 3, 2009 6:43 PM

209. Given the need for additional and replacement bridges, the portion for bridges ought to be increased.

Sat, Oct 3, 2009 6:41 PM

210. This is bad, do not do it.

Sat, Oct 3, 2009 4:27 PM

211. Limit the population by limiting the public resources available to them. Stop taxing the business and working class out of existence in Oregon to pay for unnecessary and unwanted "public" resources. Stop subsidizing the underemployed for the benefit of big business. Get rid of METRO and the consultant class that have destroyed business interests in Oregon and are destroying livability and farm land that we will need in the future. METRO's goals are just plain wrong, they do not represent the wishes of the people and

Sat, Oct 3, 2009 4:13 PM

< 1 _____ >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

its projects are classic pork barrel. The whole process is a tragic, cruel joke. Shame on the members of our legislature who have inflicted this upon the people of Oregon. Do not reelect anyone currently in office and check out who is backing the people you vote for. Vote METRO out of existence.

212. Roads should not be widened. If more capacity is needed it should be achieved by automation (e.g., autonomous vehicles), electrification of vehicles and their being routed in tunnels. The same applies to rail. The general public should not bear the external costs (adverse effects) imposed on it and the users should pay to eliminate them. Examples of these external costs are noise, air pollution, the danger to pedestrians of crossing and walking adjacent to busy streets. Sat, Oct 3, 2009 1:29 PM

213. I do not see monies set aside for education, especially thru schools. Bicycling and walking need to be encouraged through organized events sponsored and supported by the public schools, school boards and PTOs. Sat, Oct 3, 2009 12:32 PM

214. It looks good overall but I think Transit should be a slightly higher priority. I'm not sure where I would take from to increase Transit funding. I'm interested in projects that increase the frequency and safety of transit lines. Sat, Oct 3, 2009 11:31 AM

215. Metro must focus emphasis on improving quality of life not on increasing the regions population. this is a hard problem however our leadership must engage this most important issue. Aske the question do we want one million more people in the region by 2035. We must manage this. Sat, Oct 3, 2009 11:05 AM

216. I don't know. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 10:43 PM

217. We need passenger/commuter trains. There is still too much priority given to cars. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:23 PM

218. Focus on rapid transit, with improvements to roads where only partial improvement exists and/or dangerous conditions exist. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 5:21 PM

219. Build the largest Columbia Crossing possible Fri, Oct 2, 2009 3:11 PM

220. Impossible to comment since you have lumped roads and bridges together and much of that cost is driven by the real need for two new bridges: I-5 and Sellwood. The question is not really on dollars but on miles of type of new transporation and people access units. The comparison on a \$\$ basis is really silly since we cannot be expected to know the unit costs of bikeways, bridges, light rail, or etc. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 2:29 PM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

221. I suggest reducing the Transit costs while improving health and quality of life. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 1:50 PM

Initially this will cost more but out a few years the curves will cross. The "how" is to scrap the fleet of diesel buses, avoid adding filtration to stop the soot (expensive), and buy smaller hybrid buses similar to those used at some airports and made in the US. Deploy these in a "smart" way, with additional units sent to computer calculated need points and outsource maintenance. Diesel fumes are a major factor in cardiac, lung and cancer diseases and recent data have surprised even the experts because of the strong risk. We live near Hwy 43 so we are directly affected. Senior women show the most increase in risk factors. Please consider moving to hybrid units. I have heard all the reasons why you can't. Please try to look at it the other way around. Second suggestion: Start spending more to create safe and continuous bike paths and consider amenities such as covered bike paths. Please do not consider taking away property rights and building contrary to the neighborhood and local interests but work to make sure these are done properly. If bike routes are pushed through against the will of the people in places where they are not wanted or needed and the actual needed bike routes are ignored, this will cost more money and alienate voters and the whole thing will blow up in our faces. I find a building antagonism in Lake Oswego to safe and continuous bike paths (which I thought would be like apple pie and motherhood) because almost every neighborhood fears bike and pedestrian paths being put through were they are not wanted and no one is confident that the main bike paths will be built to be safe and continuous. This seems to be based on years of building distrust and I have to say that the Metro plan for bike paths in Lake Oswego is contrary to what the citizens want and need and follow some arbitrary idea of connecting habitats even if the paths go through private property and would cost a fortune to connect up to actual bike and pedestrian paths. In addition the idea of a "safe" path is frequently ignored and dangerous crossings and lack of adequate isolation and/or marking provided. It seems clear that the most bang for the buck in transportation is to provide safe and continuous bike and pedestrian paths which will alleviate congestion for vehicles, save energy, reduce emissions and generally improve the quality of life. So the priorities in spending and projects need to reflect that and the people need to be brought in to comment on the details to keep the devil out of them on a "perception" basis as well as a "reality" basis. This is definitely NOT being done now for the Lake Oswego bike and pedestrian projects and safety is a major immediate concern. To get the monies needed a campaign should emphasize that property rights and citizen input will be a major consideration and all the spending on diesel buses will be curtailed as soon as practical.

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

Then and only then will citizens fully support the expenditures. As a practical suggestion, please consider having a committee of scientists and urban planners study each project from a technical standpoint. You might be surprised to find that they will provide practical and cost effective solutions and eliminate the aspects that don't make sense and cost too much. I know you think this would slow things down excessively but just give the group a time limit, like a design charette. And most importantly, listen and heed after you ask them! Investment in diesel buses should be shifted to investment in smart dispatching, small hybrid vehicles and more drivers with more information at their disposal, like how many people are waiting at what stops and what the traffic conditions are and how many other buses have been dispatched on the route and all via verbal two-way communication over a hands-free radio. One more thing: The tires on these smaller buses will accept chains that don't break when you look at them so the buses would keep running in the snow. And if and when the buses are not running, there should be a display in the bus stop kiosk that tells people that. In the last snow storm my wife and I had to drive the route and tell groups of people the buses are never going to come, two of them are stranded on State at Wilbur in Lake Oswego, a modest hill but where the chains broke.

- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 222. I would like more funds to be spent on mass transit, inner city light rail, bicycle routes, and other systems that accommodate and encourage bike travel. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 1:02 PM |
| 223. I'd like to see testing of new ideas for transportation management, not just traditional solutions to ongoing issues. I hope a wide variety of participants, including citizens who are rarely asked for ideas, were included in this plan development process. The worst results typically come from plans developed only by transportation planners, business representatives and elected officials. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 12:50 PM |
| 224. More transit projects | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 12:31 PM |
| 225. We need a few MORE (not just improved) arterials/highways on the westside, as we do not have a complete or sufficient grid here. This is especially true in southeast Washington County. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:51 AM |
| 226. Not enough information. Highway number probably includes CRC which distorts the data. No indication of how these investments perform. Re-survey when you can tell us how the system performs with these investments | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:10 AM |
| 227. Look at the number of projects for sidewalks and bicycles facilities and that of Highways. While it is 'nice' that Portland is recognized as 'bicycle friendly', | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 10:30 AM |

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

commuting cyclists pay nothing for the investment being made to infrastructure improvements to accommodate this small percentage of the commuting population. The condition of existing HIGHWAYS/ROADS/BRIDGES is abysmal and congestion is at unbearable levels. Looking at the number of transit projects vs. the cost and it is glaring that the resource allocation is incongruent. I'm not saying there isn't a need for public transportation, but it feels that Metro is trying to force people to live along public transportation corridors and while that works for a small percentage of the population (particularly in the upper income levels i.e. Pearl District), demographically there is a substantially greater proportion of long-distant commuters and my guess is that is unlikely to change even in 50 years let alone in the near future. The region needs upgraded highways/freeways, more roads and road improvements. Cyclists also need to contribute their fair share for the portion of the roadways they use.

228. Improved /new roads---mainly by-passes to move people and freight more efficiently and timely. ..Continueing to funnel "people" in cars through main cities, etc. to get what??----get their money, hope they will stop to shop?--is, should not be the long range structure of our transportation plan-- Transit, (light rail type) can /should be used to move people in/out of major cities---but not at the expense of fewer roads and by pass alternatives for private transportation and commerce !!

Fri, Oct 2, 2009 10:09 AM

229. Need higher investment in freight because of the tie to our trade-dependent economy, more for TSMO because of the terrific return on investment, and less on transit since we have a great foundation now that has yet to reach its ridership potential, and there are no major O-D patterns transit doesn't already serve with HCT.

Fri, Oct 2, 2009 10:07 AM

230. My concern is creating a system that must be propped up by government because people do not support it. Self-sufficiency. There are many transit programs and projects that are not fiscally responsible. They look good and sound good but the bottom line is they are not good. People drive, they always will, it is power and freedom that cannot be translated into another medium as powerful or as inexpensive. We will pay for roads, bridges, highways because we use them. As for transit, make it pay for itself. I live in Sherwood and think a max line there would be great if it was free BUT don't want to pay \$2B for it, and don't know of another who does. The economy should be the priority. I believe we should prioritize in what people use, not social engineer what we think might be good but unsustainable and dependent so highly on other's

Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:47 AM

< 1 _____ >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

funds 1.Highways 2.Roads/Bridges 3.Freight 4.TOD 5.Transit 6.Bikes 7.Trails.
 TSMO should already be handled by ODOT, Metro, County and City instead of spending another \$200M for it. Prioritize what people want and will pay for and sustain and facilitate economy to bring new companies, ideas, people to help grow Metro area even better, if we put up walls, we limit ourselves and new ideas.

231. We need to keep in mind the lessons of places like Gaviotas (Colombia)...
 happiness of the people is the ultimate goal of development. If we improve our conditions, if we make living and working locally easier, if we improve equity and have fewer 'good neighborhood'/'bad neighborhood' dichotomies, if we encourage mass transit and biking and walking, if we give kids room to play and explore and learn, then we're doing well. I very much appreciate the stated goals. As long as we don't lose sight of citizen happiness as the actual goal, I'm sanguine about the balance of expenditures.
 One specific thing I'd love to see: Oregon City included (as was discussed MANY years ago) in the light rail picture. It would be a fine Southern corner for the Green Line Loop.... continue S from Clackamas Town Center and then head northwest to connect with Milwaukie. It would certainly make me a light-rail rider at long last.

Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:28 AM

232. Your plan is flawed because it fails to analyse the actual economic cost to the people between auto and mass transit. The fares on mass transit need to equal the actual operating costs. I work with a gentleman who use to work on the audit of the old Rose City Transit and his comment was they never operated in the red, as long as he can remember. Then in steps Metro to take over the bus system. The last I read was that Metro's fares collected only cover 20% of the operating costs. If this is true, Metro has managed to take a profitable venture and trun it into a negative annual loss of 80%. You have ignored the roads for over twenty years and we will pay for this dearly. Transit times have increased by fifty percent(based on my own experience). This transit time is the same for bus or car.
 I-5 has become a daily mess. Just think of all the fuel that is wasted in clogged roads. We have failed to develope jobs close to where people live and thus force them to travel longer to their jobs. You have failed to actually realized what the problems are and how to fix them. You have tunnel vision that only sees mass transit and ignores the real needs of the people.

Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:09 AM

233. Increase percentage of money for new transit projects at the expense of highways. Initiate a tollling system (with subsidies for low income earners) on

Fri, Oct 2, 2009 8:56 AM

< 1 _____ >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

all highway arterials that will reduce "rush hour" use and raise revenue for road maintenance. Work with the state to raise the gas tax a considerable amount, and if the state is unwilling to do it, to add a Metro gas tax, which will reduce automobile use and raise revenue for roads.

234. TSMO? This is an acronym for what? From the description, I would guess "Transportation System Money Openhole" but maybe it's something else...
 I like the focus on improving current infrastructure (Roads and Bridges). As a driver and a pedestrian, I would like to see money spent on bike roads - separate distinct wide safe (did I mention separated?) areas for bike transportation. First because it would reduce my interaction with bicycles in places where their movements are unpredictable and risky (ie roads and sidewalks) and second because then I wouldn't be so scared to ride my bike.

Fri, Oct 2, 2009 8:06 AM

235. less money spent on transit more money spent on bridges and roads, Make people who ride bikes pay for bike facilities, either by registration, or other fees.

Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:34 AM

236. More is needed to develop highways through the west hills to Washington County and less for mass transit. Bike lanes are needed in this same area as many are using narrow winding roads for recreation and travel to areas in Washington county from North Portland. This need will become increasingly important as industry in Washington county outstrips industry in Multnomah Co. Street cars are a known loser and only good for feel good experiences they were proven a poor investment in the 1950's.

Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:34 AM

237. Freight movement needs to be near the top. Freight movement = economic growth and well being. Freight movement can add to bottle necks or decrease bottle necks, Trucks add more pollution to air when they stop. Keeping freight moving keeps air cleaner, keeps cars moving better and keeps cost of delivery down. \$ spent on moving freigh cannot be spent on growing business. Growing business = growth for the community so we have more money to spend on the nice to have stuff like trails.
 Protect our current investment in infastructure, then improve or add to the items that add enjoyment.
 It is cheeper to maintain than it is to repair our infastructure.

Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:26 AM

238. Is \$632 million enough to cover freight for railroads? I've been told it takes almost a million dollars a mile to maintain rail lines. We have what appears to be an underutilized port in Portland. We also have two major rail ines runnig along the Columbia River and alongthe coast. This could be an important part

Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:23 AM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

of our economy if we can leverage the existing facilities.

239. Seems to me that as fuels become more expensive, there will not be MORE cars. So investments in transportation (roads, highways, freeways) might better focus on maintaining the capacity we have at high quality, but not so much on capacity. Bottlenecks of today may fade as fewer people drive. Investments in rail (both freight and passenger) are small in this budget; they will be increasingly important. Their role would be much greater today if they had been as high a priority as car-based transportation infrastructure. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:22 AM

240. Emphasis on transit is too high. Transit is great if you live near a line and work downtown. For us people who live and work away from downtown, the system takes far to long to travel across town. Going from bus to train to bus and spending more than 90 minutes each way when you can drive in 35 minutes is a bad trade off. If they had built the lines with stations on sidings so you could do express trains, it would be so much faster for those coming in from the outer areas. I also often travel with tools and materials and transit of bicycles are not an option. A mindset to get almost everyone onto transit on a bicycle is not realistic for many if not most people. Anticipate we will still have private vehicles, powered by electricity or some other fuel in 2035, and will still need the road system and parking facilities. I recommend you increase the investment in the roads and bridges with less going to transit and bicycle. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:21 AM

241. More needs to be put into building new roads to accomaidate frieght and to keep people from moving outside the METRO area a creating even a greater problem Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:16 AM

242. Minimize increasing and improving freeways -- that just attracts more SOVs: "You can't build your way out of congestion". Implement traffic management approaches, e.g. left turn lanes, timed signals, enforce laws against blocking intersection; enforce using turn signals so people can turn left w/o waiting so long. Use \$ to increase frequency of mass transit so using it will be more attractive than driving. Public education on how to ride and drive more thoughtfully. Drive less/save more program is good. Jam it down our throats. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:03 AM

243. There is two much freight traffic on the highway. Apparently more trucks cross the I5/Willamette Boone Bridge at Wilsonville than the Columbia between Portland & Vancouver each day. Freight should return to the railways. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 6:40 AM

244. There needs to be more emphasis on roads and not transit. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 5:42 AM

< 1 >

250 responses per page

answered question **327**

skipped question **154**

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

245. Transit should be paid for by Tri-met themselves! They already get tax money and they are not a non profit company! Put more of the costs of roads by taxing them! Fri, Oct 2, 2009 3:51 AM

246. we need to invest in mass transit, bikes, and walking. Cut investments in bigger highways and more places for cars to travel should be deemphasized. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 9:51 PM

247. I would like to see more investments in bike and pedestrian facilities and better bike/walk access to transit. Maintenance of existing roads should be a priority but expanding and adding roads and lanes should be the last priority unless these are directly tied to job creation or protecting our industrial area jobs. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 8:44 PM

248. I'd say 20% less on "Road and Bridge" projects and 10% more on "transit" and the remaining 10% split between "Regional Trails" and "Bike Facilities and Sidewalks". Our Feet, along with Bikes and Trains are going to be the way we get around when all the oil is burned up. We better be ready when that day comes along. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:53 PM

249. There should be no expansion of road or highway capacity. Also, I'm concerned too much of the transit budget is devoted to projects like light rail, commuter rail, and streetcar and not nearly enough to doing more with our bus system such as bus-only lanes, transit signal pre-emption/priority, bus rapid transit, consolidated transit stops, etc.. Lastly, we should emphasize bike system improvements, so would like to see more devoted to bike and ped systems. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:52 PM

250. too much money WASTED on inefficient mass transit - WES! Tualatin needs local buses rather than community ruining transit. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:33 PM

250 responses per page

answered question **327**

skipped question **154**

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

**Response
Count**

 [Hide replies](#)

327

251. More than half the planned spending is geared toward promoting increasing use of single-occupant vehicles. Much more emphasis should be put on developing a better infrastructure for alternative modes of transportation, especially walking and bicycling. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:27 PM

252. More emphasis on bike facilities, transit, and trails. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:25 PM

253. More bike and public transportation, less highways. Bridges may need the \$ due to repairs. No 12 lane Columbia River Crossing. No CRC unless it has max. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:13 PM

answered question **327**

skipped question **154**

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

254. Highways should not be expanded. The additional needs should be met by more trains. Portland needs a subway system. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:16 PM

I5 from 5 miles south of the Marqum Street bridge to 5 miles north of the Interstate brige should be put underground.

255. Don't make highways wider - try to maximize existing usage Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:02 PM
 Roads & Bridges: need to be maintained with earthquake retrofitting
 Bike facilities/sidewalks: need to be maintained/ADA compliant and will benefit everyone
 Transit: improve connection between WA and OR state to minimize need to be on road driving solo
 TSMO/Freight/TOD/Other: this should be balanced with other ideas, such as making buses/train schedules more frequently, subsidies should be developed to reduce cost of riding on public transportation system, especially in a time when there are many unemployed/students who must depend on the transportation system to commute to school/work.

256. My priorities are [first most important]: Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:01 PM
 1. Railroads
 2. Mass transportation [busses, MAX, etc.]
 3. Trucking
 4. Bike trails
 5 Highways & streets

257. More money on Transit than on Highways is not correct. We love transit, but highways is more important for more uses. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 5:54 PM
 I love to bike, but too much is planned here. Best biking is 1 block parallel to a main arterial on a nice side street. No trucks, buses, exhaust. I ride a LOT, but avoid most bike lanes.

258. The priority of Roads and Bridges seems too small especially as this category Thu, Oct 1, 2009 5:44 PM
 includes sidewalks and bike facilities.

259. more rapid transit, less highway construction, more trails/bikepaths/sidewalks Thu, Oct 1, 2009 5:37 PM

260. Safety is of utmost priority. Increased mass transit is critical to get more people Thu, Oct 1, 2009 5:25 PM
 out of cars. Recently in a car at high
 use time entering Washington DC the road was slow and go for 45 miles and
 almost every car except mine had only one occupant. And DC has a mass

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

transit. We must have more dense cities and fewer cars, or we are going to choke both on space and dirty air.

261. Bike boulevards are the best way for Portlanders to both commute and to stay in reasonable shape. 5% is not enough to sustain this lifeblood. I realize the roads aren't in the best shape, but maybe 1% from roads and 1% from transit would push 2% more of the population onto bikes. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:52 PM

262. not a bad BALANCE of projects, as far as allocations go, but the projects themselves are wasteful and unimaginative. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:52 PM

one example:

spend a billion on incentives to businesses to stagger their work hours - spread rush-hour around all 24 hours and end rush hour gridlock.

this would result in

1. a cheaper, more beautiful, and more functional interstate bridge.
2. the long-last chance to remove the east-side I-5 section altogether, redesignate I-405 as I-5, and use the lower deck of the marquam bridge as I-5 access to southeast portland.
3. turning the upper deck of the marquam bridge into the most spectacular urban park in the world.
4. hang portlandia on it, facing downtown

263. I think smaller cities streets should have some percentage and keep existing fright rail and update current systems in place. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:45 PM

264. One percent of dollars for maintenance seems low. I would also be inclined to move 7-10 percent out of Transit and into a combination of Highways and Roads and Bridges. While I like to "think green", I don't believe that the million new people we are planning for are as green as we would like. Out the new million people, are 32 percent (what is allocated) of them going to take transit or are most of them going to drive? As much as we would like to change behavior, I think most will drive. This means that we need to favor roads. If we budgeted more like 25 percent to transit, we would still be heavily encouraging Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:28 PM

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

transit, but we would also be building and updating the roads we need. I doubt that out of the new million people, one fourth of them (250,000) will be transit users -- most of them will be driving. The portion we spend on transit should be proportional to the anticipated portion of people who will use transit, plus a bit to encourage transit use (but not plus too much as to radically limit road capacity below the realistic load caused by cars.) We want some social engineering, but not too much.

- | | | |
|-------------|---|--------------------------|
| 265. | Maintaining what we have is important. I don't know how the pie charts depict maintenance. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:14 PM |
| 266. | More emphasis on rail - both freight and people. Freight on rails reduces long-haul trucking. Rail for people, but provide parking -- as in Northeast Portland!!!! | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:07 PM |
| 267. | We just can't repeat failed strategies when we know we will have growth, we must starve out highways and massive road/individualistic roads or we'll end up with more sprawl. less freight by road, less pollution means shrinking highways capacity not increasing it. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:07 PM |
| 268. | Too much emphasis on bicycle projects. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:55 PM |
| 269. | There is a need for some NEW arterials - if not freeways - on the westside. The grid is not complete on this side and it is choking all modes, especially in the south east county. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:52 PM |
| 270. | Reduce highway funds. More money to bicycle, pedestrian and transit | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:47 PM |
| 271. | Rail mass transit and freight hauling needs more emphasis. Forget about widening highways -- it's money down a rat hole. In ten years or so, there will be much less auto and truck traffic. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:32 PM |
| 272. | Adjust Transit investment lower, roads and bridges higher | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:32 PM |
| 273. | The percentage of pedestrian and bicycle projects compared with the relatively low cost of these projects seems to indicate both the increasing need for walking and biking alternatives and their cost effectiveness. When looked at relative to highway projects (where the inverse is true), it becomes difficult to understand why pedestrian and bicycle options don't comprise a bigger piece of the proverbial, and in this case literal, pie. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:29 PM |
| 274. | I am not sure if replacement bridges is the same as repair. I know there are many bridges that need replacing and cannot be just maintained, i.e. Sellwood | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:28 PM |

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

is an example. If this means taking money from other areas, it should come from the highways segment.

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>275. Increase funding for freight rail, passenger rail, and sidewalk and bicycle facilities. Withdraw any funding from Portland Streetcar: it's a leisure amenity, not a transit option. Instead of funding more TOD, make buses support high-capacity transit better.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:25 PM</p> |
| <p>276. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities warrant far more investment than 5%. Highways and roads should constitute less than 50% of the projects and costs.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:14 PM</p> |
| <p>277. In order to address climate change goals, 2/3 of funding should be spent on projects that promote ped/bike/transit mobility.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:03 PM</p> |
| <p>278. Reduce congestion. Clearly, transit and bike lanes have not done that.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:02 PM</p> |
| <p>279. Increase Transit to 40% and reduce Highways to 15%--always stress building up rather than out.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:57 PM</p> |
| <p>280. Increase bicycle and pedestrian funding to move beyond simply "completing gaps" as the plan states. Need to forge new routes, options and infrastructure for bicycles and pedestrians.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:56 PM</p> |
| <p>281. Much more should be spent on bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and less on highways, roads and automobile bridges.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:54 PM</p> |
| <p>282. Transit amount is too high. Roads and bridges in the area are heading the way of a third world country. When are you going to rebuild the sellwood bridge. Instead a truly stupid pedestrian only bridge is on the table as a transit option. What about the replacement of the I5 bridge across the Columbia? We just have artists and dreamers wasting our time with expensive frills.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:53 PM</p> |
| <p>283. I believe that the transit budget would be better spent on existing highways and roads. I would also transfer a portion from transit to sidewalks/bikes and regional trails.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:51 PM</p> |
| <p>284. Put a much greater emphasis on Bike facilities and more on transit relative to highways/roads/bridges.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:47 PM</p> |
| <p>285. Would like to see improvements made that allow traffic to bypass cities like Beaverton and Tigard to relieve the heavy traffic that increasing outlying populations have brought and will bring.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:47 PM</p> |

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

286. It is hard to know from the number of projects and dollars alone if this is the "right" mix. Philosophically I favor more investment in public transportation systems including bikes and walking because they are more environmentally friendly. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:44 PM

287. I'd like to see how these investments change over time: some (roads and bridge, e.g.) may be ongoing and constant; others (highways, bike facilities, freight access) might be heavy on up-front costs and lessen over time. But I don't see any problem with the overall mix, which seems to give a boost to transit and bikes. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:44 PM

288. A lot of areas don,t want sidewalks so spend that portion of the money very carefully. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:44 PM

289. Should be less for transit and more for bike paths Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:41 PM

290. You haven't addressed personal safety/crime. What will you do to protect riders from muggings. We feel safe in our cars. We don't feel safe on busses or light rail. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:39 PM

291. I agree with bus service, but I have seen a huge change in crime brought in the area I live and work in due to the light rail. I wonder if it does more harm than good. I know a lot of people who will NOT ride the rail because it is so unsafe. Less money should go to trails. If people want trails let them get together as a community & work on the trails. I think the highways and roads should get more money and transit system, trails, and sidewalks/bicycles should get less money. You need good roads and highways to transport goods and services that support life. All the other areas are secondary and not really needed to support life. The roads and highways are used by trucks bringing food and supplies to communities; used by ambulances to get sick and injured to hospitals, etc. The remaining areas do not contribute to these life-sustaining needs, so they should be allotted much less importance. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:39 PM

292. I am most interested in improving our system by improving roads so freight and businesses can operate in a timely matter- they can't use buses and mass transit so more dollars toward roads. Bike lanes and sidewalks are nice but in some areas I think they are over done. Trails add a nice liveability to the area. Use all money more efficiently and what works for the majority - our mass transit could have been done better I hope we have learned from past mistakes- more policing and safety for passengers-ticket machines that work-bigger parking areas for instance Sunset transit parking way under built no Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:39 PM

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

excuse for that.

293. Decrease highways and increase transit/bike/TOD Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:38 PM

294. The investment strategy is much too aggressive in movement away from conventional transportation mode improvements. It is way too high in bike, sidewalk and transit. Bike does not have an income stream and transit is way more expensive to build, maintain and operate. It only serves about 4% of the transportation segment. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:37 PM

295. The Metro area is saddled with two issues in highway traffic: 1. to provide for commuter and local traffic; 2. to provide an arterial for long-distance personnel and cargo traffic for the West Coast from San Diego to Vancouver B.C. The limitations imposed on the capacities of I-5 and I-205, especially the lane limitation of the needed and proposed interstate I-5 bridge are short sighted and the reasons given are illusory. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:33 PM

296. Our aging infrastructure is of major concern. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:32 PM

297. More on freight, transit, trails, and TOD. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:28 PM
Less on highways.

298. Less on freight, bike facilities and sidewalks and trails Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:28 PM

299. Given our large investment in light rail, I believe more people would use the systems if the 'last mile' problem could be solved. A more nimble fleet of smaller type shuttles instead of behemoth TriMet buses might serve us better. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:26 PM

300. Transit and bike appear to account for a disproportionate amount of funding relative to their share of trips. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:23 PM

301. I do not know the costs of respective work projects on bridges, hwy, trails, etc, but it appears that the funds allocated to regional trails & bike facilities and sidewalks are low. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:23 PM

302. I haven't heard much about the concept of dedicated express busways. Many US cities have them, including Pittsburgh, PA. Bus-controlled traffic signals are another option, as they have in Eugene. We spend a heck of a lot of money on rail and, though I think it's productive, it's enormously expensive, I think we've become blind to equal or better alternatives. Busways require much less investment than rail. Also, I note that to ride from Clackamas Town Center to downtown Portland takes a long time! Is there a lot of traffic from Hollywood to Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:21 PM

< 2 >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

Clackamas? No. So why do riders making that trip have to stop in Hollywood, or the other MAX stops. This is the problem with rail – there is no express service and because of right-of-way issues widening the existing tracks in dense areas is not an option. So in addition to my suggestion about busways, I'd like to see attention being given to express transit. Portland's gotten too big to assume riders are content to stop at every stop on a ten or fifteen mile trip.

- | | | |
|-------------|---|--------------------------|
| 303. | We don't spend enough on roads and highways. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:19 PM |
| 304. | More investment in trails for bikes and pedestrians is needed, less money is needed for highways. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:17 PM |
| 305. | This is some really complex stuff, and I'm worried that 1) you're soliciting input based on very little detail to us, 2) that you're trusting uninformed bystanders to give you some feedback, and 3) you're not giving us more of a change to admit we have no idea, or flag where we are confused. My real answer here is "I'm not sure." | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:17 PM |
| 306. | You need to focus on roads and bridges not bikes and sidewalks and transit which the people continue to vote against. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:16 PM |
| 307. | Reduce transit costs substantially by halting new, very expensive, light rail and use buses and Bus Rapid Transit when appropriate. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:13 PM |
| 308. | We need more roads. Given that you've done nothing for 30 years to educate youth to ride public transit the car population is growing too fast. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:10 PM |
| 309. | commuter rail options should be structured to avoid road crossings by building bridges and over/underpasses, and allow for faster light rail & WES commuting | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:08 PM |
| 310. | Rideshare- HOV lanes- significant investment in decreasing SOV and getting more people ridesharing- It has the greatest potential for mode split- much higher than transit, biking, walking combined. We've made a significant investment in light rail and transit and it is time to shift a bit and focus on HOV solutions. It may require more roads or lanes as well. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:07 PM |
| 311. | There is not enough information to make any intelligent comment on the distribution of funds. The problems with light rail, streetcars and those types of transportation modes are that they are not flexible to adjust to new routes without a huge expense and long time to get them. More emphasis should be on buses that can change routes and aren't dependent on electricity and wires to operate in bad weather conditions. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:06 PM |

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

312. more sidewalks and bikes, less on highways and roads, other than maintenance. Gas will be \$12 a gallon soon enough. fuel costs increased some 300% in the previous 25 years, that curve is likely to continue to increase, and we'll all be willing to bike it or hoof it in the near future. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:01 PM

313. Make sure transit money is used for the best good and not for boutique projects like trams and streetcars that benifit few and are expensive. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 1:58 PM

314. Until such a time as personal cars are 99% carbon neutral in their operation, the vast majority of expenditures, thought and effort need to be limited to projects to help reduce the number of cars and trucks on the roads. Innovations in the transportation of goods, increase in the ease and safety of bicycle use and mass transit, encouragement of local food production and consumption. We should be making it harder and more expensive to run gasoline and diesel powered vehicles for any reason. Look at the huge upsurge in bicycle and mass transit usage caused by the relatively minor bump in fuel prices last year. Stop focusing on a growth economy. Focus on a livable lifestyle economy instead. Read the book Deep Economy and then re-look at transportation from a perspective of completely changing the way things are. I know people fear change, but in this case, their fear will kill them. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 1:57 PM

315. Bike facilities and sidewalk improvements are dollar wise out of portion with freight movement. With more product moving via the internet and less on instore buying there has to be more attention taken to facilitating product movement. If you do not make this mode of transporation safe and fast you loose on all of the above. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 1:55 PM

316. Transit is critical. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 1:52 PM

317. Way too much money is being spent on bike facilities. User fees should apply to this community. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 1:49 PM

318. fewer highway dollars, more emphasis on passenger rail and freight movement Thu, Oct 1, 2009 1:46 PM

319. I believe this is a very well-balanced program, and would encourage each segment to explore the boundries of green technology to keep Oregon in the forefront of this science. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 1:40 PM

320. Transit should get a larger percentage of the funds and projects, and highways should get a smaller percentage. Tue, Sep 29, 2009 10:55 PM

< >

250 responses per page

answered question 327

skipped question 154

2. Please give Metro your view of how the region should adjust the emphasis for each type of investment to better address transportation issues and needs.

321. There should be less money for highways and more for rail and water transport. Mon, Sep 28, 2009 5:18 PM

322. Bike, sidewalks, trails, and TODs all need about 50% more funding. = \$700 million Mon, Sep 28, 2009 3:21 PM
 Transit needs about \$1 billion more.
 This should come from highways, roads, bridges, and freight.
 More freight should be transported by railroad than currently.

323. Much less should be apportioned to highways and roads/bridges--these need to be maintained but should not be expanded at the expense of transit. Transit should get a much higher percentage of the total budget, with some additional going to the other non-road/highway areas as well. Mon, Sep 28, 2009 2:35 PM

324. I'd like to see more investment in regional trails and bicycle/pedestrian facilities, particularly those that emphasize biking and walking as true transportation choices. Wed, Sep 23, 2009 7:56 AM

I also believe most of our highway and roads dollars should be used for maintenance and managing travel demand and system efficiency rather than for expansion.

325. I think widening highways is folly. More lanes will only incent more driving. I would like to see the region put more focus on environmentally friendly modes and demand management programs - even it is disproportionate to the mode share of those mode types. If we want to meet the challenges of climate change and meet RTP's stated goals, significant investment will be needed. Tue, Sep 22, 2009 8:28 PM

326. More funds need to go to Highways. You need to revisit the Mt Hood Freeway concept. Less money to Tri-Met. It has wasted our transit funds for long enough. No further funds need to go to bike trails/facilities and and regional trails, funds need to be tranferred to Highways and roads. Wed, Sep 16, 2009 6:36 PM

327. I'm not sure if Regional trails includes bike only trails, but Metro definitely needs to do all it can to build bike/pedestrian only trails and public transit only ways. I understand the need for widening highways, but perhaps just improving them would be sufficient. We want to encourage folks to use public transport options. Providing high density commuter options might be a better solution. For instance, run a low-cost shuttle/bus to/from Salem that departs from park and rides near Portland, etc. Tue, Sep 15, 2009 7:53 PM

< >

250 responses per page

answered question **327**

skipped question **154**

3. As an element of the RTP, the Regional High Capacity Transit System Plan identified priorities for future investments in light rail, commuter rail, rapid streetcar and bus rapid transit. The process identified three near-term priorities:

- Portland to Gresham in the vicinity of Powell Boulevard
- Portland to Tigard or Sherwood in the vicinity of Barbur Boulevard/Highway 99E
- service upgrades to all day, 15-minute service on WES between Beaverton and Wilsonville

[>Learn more about the high capacity transit tiers](#)

[>Learn more about the high capacity transit planning process](#)

If the region focuses on the top tier of priority corridors, is that enough for high capacity transit investments?

		Response Percent	Response Count
No, the focus should be more high capacity transit.	<input type="text"/>	32.1%	109
Yes, focusing on the top tier is about right.	<input type="text"/>	40.6%	138
No, there should be less focus on high capacity transit in the region.	<input type="text"/>	27.4%	93
			<i>answered question</i>
			340
			<i>skipped question</i>
			141

4. Comments:

**Response
Count**

 [Hide replies](#)

206

1. However, I think "upgrading" WES to light rail is unwarranted given it's low-ridership and frequent outtages Fri, Oct 16, 2009 2:48 AM

2. Nothing but a good bus system will get into every neighborhood. People w/limited financial resources live in neighborhoods that need good bus service. If the buses were air conditioned and the service was free or of very limited cost, many more people would ride the bus. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:20 PM

3. Shouldn't that question involve Barbur Boulevard/Highway 99W, not 99E? Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:44 PM

4. Recently, trimet cut some of it's service stating that there was a loss in public usage and interest. More cuts are projected. The economy is not in an upswing yet, not enough of one for us to feel safe. Budget cuts happen at home too, and evaluating expendable expenses is a hard, but necessary job. Support the public, let them invest back into the economy & save money...use trimet! Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:36 PM

5. Funds should focus more on high-capacity local transit. For example, not from Beaverton to Wilsonville, but from North Bethany to Hillsboro. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:31 PM

250 responses per page

answered question **206**

skipped question **275**

4. Comments:

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| <p>6. The MAX line has been expanded enough outside of Portland. HWY focus is now needed.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 4:26 PM</p> |
| <p>7. would like to see the max trains go to Oregon city</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:46 PM</p> |
| <p>8. The Max is a great system but . . . too much \$\$ is wasted on Admin which are overpaid and do absolutely nothing. The public is not as ignorant as you may think. One quarter of Admin employees are useless. We shouldn't be wasting transit \$\$'s when the middle class folks are struggling.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:45 PM</p> |
| <p>9. In the spirit of serving those who already live here (as opposed to those we're expecting to come), at a price most people will be able to afford, it would be much more advantageous to the region to invest in very frequent, high capacity bus service, in a much denser network, before investing in rail-based corridors. The cost would be much lower, and flexible - movable at such time as population density reaches levels needed to justify much larger rail service investments.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:28 PM</p> |
| <p>10. Committing to these projects, and funding them, will alleviate a lot of traffic woes.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:17 PM</p> |
| <p>11. Less emphasis on mass transit...thats because this area and in fact all areas were developed without the use of mass transit. Typiically economies that rely on mass transit are referred to as 3rd world economies...also the assertion that mass transit and biking is good for the economy is patently absurd given in this current recession that Oregon has consistantly had one of the worst unemployment rates in the country.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 2:19 PM</p> |
| <p>12. Focus on quality of life. saving farmlands, and open space. Not growth and paving our topsoil and forests. Improve what we already have.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:30 PM</p> |
| <p>13. Please make sure you have public space and business targeted at public gatherings near bus/light rail stops. The fact there is little or no public space near the eastside MAX platforms is a significant part of why the platforms are problematic.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:06 PM</p> |
| <p>14. There is already both light rail and bus service between Portland and Gresham. Granted that another rail line "in the vicinity of" Powell Boulevard is desirable, should it really be at the top of the priority list just now?</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 12:38 PM</p> |
| <p>15. None of the above unless high capacity transit includes not just east-west arterials via a rail system of some kind. More local service to get to the high capacity transit.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 12:28 PM</p> |

250 responses per page

answered question 206

skipped question 275

4. Comments:

16. Most of us want to get to a location and back. Right now our Tualatin problem is gaining access at all times. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 11:48 AM
-
17. Max needs a Portland bypass, the low speed and multiple stops turn a decent transportation tool into a tourist trolley. The west side also needs another North South option similar to the 205 on the east side. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 11:38 AM
-
18. Tri-met is worst run company in the world. Fred Hanson should be fired. WES is disaster and lack of parts or spare train will always mean delays. Crime is rampant on MAX. Until crime is controlled no more light rail! Thu, Oct 15, 2009 11:19 AM
-
19. Need a direct train route from Hillsboro to Tigard and Wilsonville. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:50 AM
-
20. I agree that transit is needed given our conditions. Must all busses seem to be so big? What is the actual ridership capacity per available passenger space. In downtown why aren't there also smaller busses? Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:07 AM
-
21. Again Portland gets its tax dollars from people who drive cars 99% of the time. Raise fees on the max and bus lines to come up with this dough. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:28 AM
-
22. look for routes that are going to develop in the future that can be done cheaply. Example to Forest Grove where train right of way exists already. Population growth will be in areas not already overcrowded. Growth will follow high transit. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:26 AM
-
23. At this point in time, nobody know what the future of transit will be. As far as we can tell, people prefer to drive their own vehicles. They are more productive citizens when they drive their own vehicles. Access to a person vehicle has been directly linked to unemployment. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:25 AM
-
24. Given the metro region growth potential, I believe there couldn't be enough high capacity transit investments. The proposal gives an excellent starting point, but providing additional transit investments will secure the future needs for the community. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:48 AM
-
25. Sorry, but I just don't feel I have enough info to comment on the balance between these two. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:40 AM
-
26. The WES line, when it is running should have been designed to have a stop at Washington Square Mall. Again, very poor planning of the system by the powers to be and payoffs/bribes from special interest for there own agendas. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 7:08 AM
-
27. While probably not a viable near-term option, extending the MAX system to Vancouver (to relieve bridge traffic and provide a viable non-automobile Thu, Oct 15, 2009 7:06 AM

250 responses per page

answered question 206

skipped question 275

4. Comments:

commuting option for Vancouver residents working in Portland) should be a long-term priority.

-
- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 28. Seems well planned and addresses the largerst number of people. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:55 AM |
|--|---------------------------|
-
- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 29. Light rail spending has resulted in the decline of roads and bridges. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:24 AM |
|--|---------------------------|
-
- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 30. I think 15 minute service is too often and a waste of money. I took mass transit for 8 years 2000-2008 into Portland from Tualatin, many of the buses were not filled to capacity if the schedule ran 15 mins or less outside of am and pm peak times. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:23 AM |
|---|---------------------------|
-
- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 31. WES is a perfect example of failure. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:20 AM |
|---|---------------------------|
-
- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 32. Bus service is a proven efficient method of igh capacity transit. Tha's were the focus and fuding should be. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:32 AM |
|---|---------------------------|
-
- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 33. The bridges need work too | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:23 AM |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
-
- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 34. Again, the return on the investment is not worth it. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 6:37 PM |
|---|---------------------------|
-
- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 35. Resources should be spent on projects that address the RTPs equity and health goals, by focusing on areas with the highest concentrations of poor air qualilty, and the greatest potential to change mode choice away from SOV. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 6:15 PM |
|--|---------------------------|
-
- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 36. Barbur Blvd/ 99w/ I-5 corridor including the West Portland Town Center should be top priority for this RTP, especially the exploration of light rail, street improvements, sidewalks and bike lanes along this corridor. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 4:56 PM |
|---|---------------------------|
-
- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 37. I am a big fan/supporter of lightrail systems and what Portland has achieved through the use of MAX and its Streetcar system. I do think the balance goals and projects seem appropiate. I would like to see the Streetcar system placed in the Eastside as a stand alone system and not having it have to connect to the westside. Also, assuring that the streets are paved and maitained for buses is important. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 3:41 PM |
|--|---------------------------|
-
- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 38. Transit is very expensive and serves a limited group. Max has worked great but look at WES, I would call it a failure to this point. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 3:32 PM |
|---|---------------------------|
-
- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 39. A lot of emissions and road use come from individuals living outside of Portland and traveling in for work and leisure. I know it is difficult to build mass transit systems across state lines but Portland can not ignore Vancouver, WA. A fast speed commuter rail like the METRO line in Washington DC or the Subway in New York between Vancouver and Portland is inevitable. If this process could be started at all, I would strongly support it. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 3:26 PM |
|---|---------------------------|
-

250 responses per page

answered question 206

skipped question 275

4. Comments:

- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| 40. Need to upgrade existing bus service to improve speed. More frequent north south buses on east side of portland. Less focus on having all routes go through downtown portland. For example, the yellow line could go further south on the east side and not go downtown. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 12:53 PM |
| 41. We will need more high capacity transit but also this transit should not slow down once it enters the inner city. Focus should be on speed as well as capacity. Many people don't take max because it slows down and makes too many stops in the inner city. Some trains should skip some stops. Computer models perhaps do not agree. But many people drive because their commute is efficient until it gets close into downtown. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 10:43 AM |
| 42. For people to actually use high capacity transit, the service needs to be convenient in terms of frequency and times of day. It also needs to be safe, not just used by the dregs of society, as seems evident right now. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:37 AM |
| 43. COULD MEYTRO PLEASE GET ITS GEOGRAPHIC FACTS STRAIGHT ITS 99W THE WEST NOT 99E | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 7:24 AM |
| 44. Don't waste more money on WES | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 9:16 PM |
| 45. The WES in Wilsonville is wonderful, if you want to ride during particular hours. If there was expanded service including nights and weekends many more people could take advantage of the rapid transit. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 9:11 PM |
| 46. As stated earlier an neighborhood Avenue that has 10,000+ travelers a day should have some form of monitoring and a plan for protection and education. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:00 PM |
| 47. We must build a community that can economically survive the end of the automobile. It is critical that we have high capacity transit in place before automobiles become economically out of reach of working people. We must also emphasize high capacity transit as an adjunct to healthy, active modes of transportation. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 4:22 PM |
| 48. More emphasis needs to be placed on high capacity high speed electric transit along the major traffic corridors. By doing this we can sway more people to give up their dependence on the automobile. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 3:31 PM |
| 49. I disagree. The Powell alignment should not be a near-term priority since this east-west regional corridor is well served with the current MAX alignment. The region needs an inter-regional rapid transit network in order to attract long distant commuters out of their cars and off the freeways, especially during peak hours. Time- savings (speed) is the issue, not capacity. After all, all transit, | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 2:48 PM |

250 responses per page

answered question **206**

skipped question **275**

4. Comments:

depending on frequency, is high-capacity, but if it is slow, it will not be competitive with the car, especially if the highways are widened as proposed in this RTP. The following are projects that should be in the top tier and would focus on developing a regional rapid transit network. 1) A Yellow Line eastside connection that would greatly reduce regional north-south transit travel time making it more competitive with the auto. 2) Commuter service on the BNSF RR between Vancouver and Union Station. This 15-minute commute, if adequately served at Vancouver Station by C-Tran, would be faster and far more reliable than auto commuting on I-5. 3) Commuter service on the BNRR between Oregon City and Union Station. Amtrak makes this run in 21 minutes and with some track improvements, commuter trains could make this run even faster. The fastest peak hour bus is 45 minutes and the proposed Milwaukie MAX will not significantly reduce this running time. If both commuter routes were interlined, few long distance commutes between Clark and Clackamas Counties would be by car. 4) MAX subway between Lloyd District and Goose Hollow. This section of MAX is not rapid transit and the 22- minute plus trip over this 2-mile segment of slow "streetcar" track severely limits the attractiveness of public transit to inter-regional commuters in their cars on I-84 and hwy 26. This obviously will be a costly and time consuming project and thus should be initiated sooner instead of later.

50. Portland to Vancouver! Hello, elephant in the room. Yes, I realize that Vancouver, Clark County is not formerly part of METRO. but that doesn't change the fact that it is the busiest corridor in the entire state.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 12:39 PM
51. Widen Tualatin-Sherwood road INSTEAD of adding a new road from I-5 to 99W.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 12:07 PM
52. you didn't give definitions of high capacity or top tier.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:31 AM
53. I generally agree that the top tier HCT projects identified are the correct ones. However, I also believe that we need to investigate the notions of "branching" and of sharing rights-of-way between MAX and the Portland Streetcar. Both concepts would allow the systems to better serve larger areas and make a much better total system.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:08 AM
54. We need improvement to the current roadways not more lightrail! The lightrail system only helps areas with lightrail!	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 10:28 AM
55. Unreliable, expensive and dangerous (I don't want my family getting "baseball batted" on transit.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:19 AM
56. 99 needs a lot of help and I don't mean just more lanes. Options!	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:06 AM

250 responses per page

answered question 206

skipped question 275

4. Comments:

- | | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| <p>57. I would prefer to see more of an emphasis on mobile unit bus rapid transit, as opposed to additional light rail, commuter rail or rapid streetcar. While I do enjoy riding on these types of transit, I feel that there are limitations to such investment.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:49 PM</p> |
| <p>58. more buses more often. the bus, especially late at night is not attractive because of long wait times and incomplete service. spend the big money on more frequent buses perhaps.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:16 PM</p> |
| <p>59. the 15 minute service on the WES is great, but if it costs SO much more then maybe look at spending money in making sure there are ways to get to Portland, from the suburbs, rather than JUST car.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:55 PM</p> |
| <p>60. Don't waste any more money on commuter rail (WES type) projects</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:26 PM</p> |
| <p>61. Tualatin needs busses not more rail service</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:18 PM</p> |
| <p>62. Light rail needs to go straight down McLoughlin Blvd. to Oregon City--that should have been the first route into Clackamas County, not the Mall Train.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:06 PM</p> |
| <p>63. The reason that most people shy away from mass transit is because it is not convenient. A great deal more money and thought should be put into increasing frequency of service and comfortability of shelters and trains/buses. I personally do not use the Portland's public transportation even though I do not have a car. The wait for bus or MAX is way too long, sometimes they aren't even running when I need them, and it is too expensive. There is also a lack of transit routes going north/south on the east side.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 6:34 PM</p> |
| <p>64. This is a difficult question to answer without factoring the increasing concentration of lower-income households in Eastern Multnomah County and Gresham. Hi capacity transit will not necessarily address housing affordability concerns or access to high paying jobs in other areas. A short commute does not make up for the better life outcomes in an area with less poverty.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 5:49 PM</p> |
| <p>65. What about the west side?</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 4:07 PM</p> |
| <p>66. I think more street cars are needed and the more light rail we have in Portland the better we are as a city and ability to compete with the rest of the country in terms of jobs. A good transportation system makes good sense and even if we got the two listed above, many neighborhoods would remain unserved.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:30 PM</p> |

250 responses per page

answered question 206

skipped question 275

4. Comments:

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 67. With the growth in the Willamette Valley of wine and produce the second seems it should be a high priority | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:21 PM |
| 68. While these are excellent projects, I believe limiting the focus to these three is short-sighted. Limiting investment in car-oriented projects would free up a significant amount of funds to allow for the inclusion of additional identified high-capacity transit corridors, such as along Killingsworth St., in St. Johns, and elsewhere. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:10 PM |
| 69. In a world of unstable fuel prices and damaging climate change, the region cannot afford to move slowly when it comes to meeting the region's need for high-capacity transit. While we have made substantial progress over the past several decades, we must redouble our efforts and accelerate transit development that meets current needs and shapes development in future. This necessitates more than two near-term transit priorities. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:45 PM |
| 70. regional light rail should focus on making connections with other regional plans (Salem, Albany/Corvallis, Eugene to the South and Seattle/Vancouver North. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:43 PM |
| 71. More funds should be invested in the high capacity transit, such as street cars and light rail reaching to more neighborhoods. Foster-Powell to downtown needs transit options. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:24 PM |
| 72. I'm not sure I understand this question correctly. I think it's saying, are the three near-term priorities listed enough? I think they sound like fine projects based on my limited knowledge of those areas. However, I think mass transit is very important, and if the funding were to shift as I think it should to focus less on private vehicles, there would be room to do more transit projects. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:40 PM |
| 73. Again, land use should trump transportation. People do not really want to commute hours each day, no matter how much transit we put in. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:14 PM |
| 74. Note 99E is not located near Sherwood/Tigard this is 99W. I-5 is not functioning. Develop thru road(one lane only devoted) from Portland/Tigard/Tualatin to Salem on I-5 for trucks etc. See Florida's Freeways as example. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 11:37 AM |
| 75. An initial focus on the top tier is good, but should not create a limit on investment | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 11:00 AM |
| 76. Hi capacity doesn't mean hi demand. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:37 AM |
| 77. Included in the near-term priorities should be an extension of the Blue Line to Amber Glen in Hillsboro. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:16 AM |

250 responses per page

answered question 206

skipped question 275

4. Comments:

78. Start with being more realistic about where to put sidewalks. Connecting pieces to allow easier movement between neighborhoods, and to services is great. Not every side street needs one. New development should not be allowed to be built without the infrastructure going in to support it...we spend too much money going back & trying to correct gaps. And, I'm willing to pay tolls to raise money for new bridges & rapid mass transit. I know that this is anathema to many, but our roads/bridges/rail are a disgrace and the money isn't going to just appear by wishful thinking. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:11 AM

79. Highway investments for edge communities should be far more prominent than HCT investments. Extending HCT to Sherwood is a mistake. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:27 AM

80. Per my previous comment. Too much has been spent on HCT rail and not enough on roads for cars and buses. The region was built out not up and you need to fix roads for buses, freight and cars. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:42 AM

As the originator of the WES proposal, looking at the return on investment from cost over runs to lack of sustainable operating funds, why would you pour good money after bad?

81. Correction: it should be noted that Portland to Tigard or Sherwood is in the vicinity of Barbur Boulevard/Highway 99W (not highway 99E). Sun, Oct 11, 2009 12:48 PM

82. Need to extend the Max line down McGloughlin Boulevard to Oregon City. The WES is already underutilized, wait on making more investments in WES until it is running at capacity. How about a commuter rail from portland to Eugene, with stops in Corvallis, Albany, Salem and Woodburn, terminating at the WES station in Wilsonville? Sun, Oct 11, 2009 8:44 AM

83. Densities, demand and population distribution insufficient to support high capacity transit in the region. Sun, Oct 11, 2009 7:14 AM

84. High density of people will make roads inadequate. Fossil Fuel and the environment also needs to be addressed here. Clackamas County has large areas for development and redevelopment in the growth boundary and needs transit. Across or around the region is also critical for work and Vancouver neighbors. Sun, Oct 11, 2009 5:20 AM

85. No more on-street rail. I'd rather see more busses. Sun, Oct 11, 2009 1:22 AM

86. Barbur Blvd/Hwy 99E makes no sense. Do you mean Barbur Blvd/Hwy 99W? If you mean 99W, yes, it's much needed. Sat, Oct 10, 2009 8:06 PM

250 responses per page

answered question **206**

skipped question **275**

4. Comments:

87. The question's focus ignores north-south needs outside a loosely defined core around Portland. Not all life centers on Portland; many commuters do not use transit because to get from north to south, or vice versa, requires a trip downtown. What a monumental waste of time and resources! Sat, Oct 10, 2009 7:39 PM

88. Upgrade roads and expand capacity for cars, Sat, Oct 10, 2009 9:11 AM

89. This is a good start. Sat, Oct 10, 2009 6:47 AM

90. I hope the Milwaukie route wasn't mentioned because it is already in the early stages of being built. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 9:41 PM

91. Not sure. Docs would not come up. I would dump the WES ASAP. That was a poor investment. Certainly no more investment in this strange system. A route more direct to Sherwood makes good sense. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 6:07 PM

92. WES has not lived up to projections Fri, Oct 9, 2009 2:52 PM

93. I am concerned about access to mass transit in the North Bethany area. Many of the plans for the area stress sustainability, and it would be good if people in the North Washington County area had a mass transit option. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 2:34 PM

94. Funding should be increased to extend the light rail system from Hillsboro to Cornelius and Forest Grove Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:13 PM

95. We have a population density problem on the proposed routes in spite of the fact that TriMet has a reasonably good record of forecasting ridership. Will there be enough ridership to "justify" the cost. Light rail is not "high capacity, high speed". It concentrates service on the central city and along the alignments not jobs elsewhere in the region because to get elsewhere passengers usually have to go through the central city. Since all transit service is subsidized, the more service provided the greater the need for public funding for operations. Private vehicles on the other hand run on the subsidized cost of infrastructure (roads) but the owners pay the costs of vehicles and operation. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:00 PM

Heavy rail, WES, is very expensive service when you consider infrastructure and operating costs, more akin to underground service for which we probably don't have the money or desity to support.

Improved bus service, even electric busses may very well meet your needs.

96. Transit system too Portland centric, too much light rail. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 12:24 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 206

skipped question 275

4. Comments:

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>97. We must invest in public transit and make it readily accessible to all and convenient for day to day life even for those people commuting from distant locations. Public education campaigns is also a critical component of this.</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 12:23 PM</p> |
| <p>98. Far too much focus on projects of limited capacity.</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:40 AM</p> |
| <p>99. i really can't sort through this question very well. I think that all of the above could be funded equally, that would be ideal.</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:38 AM</p> |
| <p>100. Transit can only serve a tiny minority. Should not waste dollars on expensive and inefficient light rail.</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:36 AM</p> |
| <p>101. Yes, focus on the most congested first. Please consider connector routes in our analysis- ensure we have sidewalks and bike routes that connect with mass transit, including light rail</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:24 AM</p> |
| <p>102. Limited ridership --need more highways, roads and bridges</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:23 AM</p> |
| <p>103. There should be an increased focus on improving service, in addition to expanding it. Current light rail service is slow to the point of being impractical in many situations. While possibly beyond the influence of Metro, interstate (and international) high speed rail service needs to be improved to link Portland with the larger commercial and industrial centers of the West coast.</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:10 AM</p> |
| <p>104. As a daily commuter (via car, bike, bus and max) from the Barbur Boulevard area, I can honestly say that my 7 mile commute into the office takes my over an hour via bus/max. It seems that there needs to be some changes to accomadate those who are looking for other options of transportation then driving.</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:59 AM</p> |
| <p>105. Extending the hours of service for WES to ALL DAY would be useful to me. To make WES really useful it should be extended to Salem. I would also light rail between Sherwood and Portland. This would be along 99W, not 99E.</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:50 AM</p> |
| <p>106. Added car and truck capacity would have a higher cost/benefit return.</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:44 AM</p> |
| <p>107. The Portland to Sherwood should be understood to be a 25 year out project. How about better parallel projects like Powell and Sunset Corridors. Need to make better connections to jobs and housing. What about more short spur lines like Troutdale and Tanasbourne/High Tech connections?</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:40 AM</p> |
| <p>108. There needs to be a better connection for eastside residents to get to westside jobs. MAX functions as a streetcar in downtown Portland, adding roughly 3 1/2 hours weekly to cross-town commutes. Either a new cross-town MAX line,</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:37 AM</p> |

250 responses per page

answered question 206

skipped question 275

4. Comments:

express scheduling on some trains, or a downtown tunnel with just one stop (at Pioneer Square) would make cross town commutes more effective. The idea of adding jobs to the east side sounds good, but it hasn't happened yet.

109. More high capacity transit, more room for freight on the freeways. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:32 AM

110. We need to be careful not to spend so much on new projects that our original systems suffer. For example we should not have to decrease or remove fairless square. Some thing I use and enjoy. I used it much more when I was younger. It is a great way for young people to get around downtown. Thu, Oct 8, 2009 9:41 PM

111. No opinion. However high-capacity transit investments are spent, they should not degrade natural resources or funnel new development to areas that cannot accomodate new development. For example, high capacity transit should not be directed to areas with high value farmland. Thu, Oct 8, 2009 6:28 PM

112. I would actually answer this yes and no. I'm in favor of the Tigard, Barbur Blvd project, and I believe that's 99W not 99E, at least that's what I was always told growing up in Tigard. The WES line would most likely have to move to lightrail, seeing how the companies that own the freight lines are not in favor of sharing their lines anymore than they have to.? It would be nice to see some more connectivity between Tigard/Sherwood to I-5 and Tigard/Beaverton/Hillsboro Wed, Oct 7, 2009 1:39 PM

113. I think that high capacity transportation should be used to replace bus routes that have excessive ridership compared to the overall system and where the result will be an increase in the performance of the transit based on speed and ease as well as cost of access. Wed, Oct 7, 2009 12:55 PM

114. Since Forest Grove and Cornelius are part of Metro, to meet Metro's sustainability goals, these two areas need to have a stronger connection to the central parts of Metro. Tue, Oct 6, 2009 12:35 PM

115. We are behind most nations in the world in having adequate high capacity transit, particularly transit that is fast enough to compete with cars. More time needs to be spent figuring out how to develop transit that doesn't have to share the street grid with cars - inevitably resulting in transit that is no faster than taking a car or bus and therefore offering no time-saving advantage over those options. Second, we need to make sure that we not only make it possible for people to go to and from downtown Portland but also to get from one part of the metropolitan area to another e..g from Oregon City to Clackamas, from Gresham to Clackamas, from Clackamas and Oregon City west to Tualatin-Tigard or Beaverton. Tue, Oct 6, 2009 11:52 AM

250 responses per page

answered question 206

skipped question 275

4. Comments:

116. The second corridor listed above should be the region's highest priority. This is Tue, Oct 6, 2009 11:20 AM
99W, not 99E...

A corridor refinement plan for Barbur Blvd, I - 5 and 99W from Portland to Tigard, including associated arterials and town centers should be completed as soon as possible. I support the concept of building light rail through this corridor if the design limits removal of homes along the route.

117. Tri-Met is a huge rip-off and benefits only a portion of the Metro population. We Mon, Oct 5, 2009 9:15 PM
don't need any more trains between Beaverton and Wilsonville. The riders don't amount to hardly anything. The area population needs to be more dense to justify higher investment in transit. We are not Hong Kong or Tokyo or New York. I'd work on improving freight movement and not moving passengers on light rail.

118. See my previous comments. The more we spend on public transportation / high Mon, Oct 5, 2009 3:50 PM
capacity transportation options now, the less painful it will be to absorb a million more people in our community over the next 30 years.

119. The whole is greater than the sum of the parts. Building a complete system will Mon, Oct 5, 2009 3:45 PM
have exponential benefits for getting around.

120. The primary requirement for the success of any public transit system is based Mon, Oct 5, 2009 3:08 PM
on one factor: it must take people from where they are to where they want to go, and it must do it without overlong routes and numerous transfers.

I note that virtually all these suggestions are focused on speeding up the system. When the system is trying to serve an impossible situation (increasing numbers of people traveling increasing distances), it is not possible to achieve adequate speed (reduce travel time to an acceptable duration)

121. The next HCT priority should be the Portland to Tigard or Sherwood in the Mon, Oct 5, 2009 8:27 AM
vicinity of Barbur Boulevard corridor. The other two corridor can wait.

122. Expanding public transportation systems for Tualatin residents should be a Mon, Oct 5, 2009 8:19 AM
consideration which includes increasing WES to depart every 15 minutes, all day.

123. All day 15 minute service seems over the top. How much ridership is there? Mon, Oct 5, 2009 5:50 AM
How many people actually pay? How much money are we losing on this service? I like the idea of transit and use the train to the airport sometimes but mostly I see empty trains and buses. Maybe we should concentrate on service during rush hours? Why not do a train over lunch time downtown? I have been

250 responses per page

answered question 206

skipped question 275

4. Comments:

caught stranded at noon because there was no service then.

- | | | |
|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| 124. | Remember the voters have rejected many of your proposals, yet you press on spending money that is not yours. Remember who you work for and whose money it is your are spending. | Mon, Oct 5, 2009 5:06 AM |
| 125. | From what I understand, there aren't many people using the WES at this point. Perhaps something else should take the place of the third item on this list. | Sun, Oct 4, 2009 6:58 PM |
| 126. | High capacity transit is great but those of us who already live close to where we work should be able to use mass transit to get to work at least as fast as those who live many miles away. Focus should kept on maintaining and improving transit in the existing service areas before thoughts of expanding. | Sun, Oct 4, 2009 6:34 PM |
| 127. | this question is confusing to me. | Sun, Oct 4, 2009 4:11 PM |
| 128. | I don't know as I am a Tualatin resident and I don't really see anything that helpful for me the WES so far doesn't help me to get to Portland or back MAYBE if their was good connections from Wes to downtown Portland I could be persuaded. | Sun, Oct 4, 2009 3:14 PM |
| 129. | People where I live (Hillsdale) have no acces to high speed lines. | Sun, Oct 4, 2009 2:32 PM |
| 130. | Additional capacity in the Barbur Blvd-Sherwood corridor is needed. Light rail is way over due. Also, access from Mt. Hood highway (26) along the sunset corridor or along Powell or the Sunrise corridor needs to be improved. The ranking of priorities appears to be about right. | Sun, Oct 4, 2009 12:47 PM |
| 131. | Very supportive of high capacity transit and believe priority areas are correct. Please do not forget about buses which play a vital role high capacity transit can't. | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 6:51 PM |
| 132. | We dont need this pork barrel | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 4:24 PM |
| 133. | I think it's good to place our focus on high capacity tiers but would like to see most lines eventually become frequent service. | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 11:37 AM |
| 134. | With a stable populaiton the focus can be on quality of life, health care, living wage jobs, affordable housing and elimination of poverty. | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 11:10 AM |
| 135. | Does the Tigard/Sherwood connection mean 99W, not 99E? I wonder about whether this form of transit will, as freeways did, encourage development at the periphery at the expense of better transit closer to the core. | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 6:57 AM |
| 136. | I see nothing for my area of Portland. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:02 PM |

250 responses per page

answered question 206

skipped question 275

4. Comments:

137. Portland to Oregon City via 99E needs rapid transit. We need to invest in commuter trains. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:29 PM
-
138. Service upgrade to all day service on Trimet Route #96 should also be considered. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 5:30 PM
-
139. Keep frequent service on #4 & #14 bus lines Fri, Oct 2, 2009 3:15 PM
-
140. I think the high capacity transit routes should be secured so they are not blocked by development but I think the actual transit building should be post-poned until the need is more clear and the money more available. I think money should be spent on fixing the immediate needs and providing safe and continuous bike trails. The bike trails should be built properly and with respect to citizen input and local businesses and residents. Urban planning should be considered to maximize transit efficiency and location of business parks and shopping centers so they are accessible by bike. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 2:44 PM
-
141. I discussed the RTC process with staff at the Beaverton work session and feel fairly confident that the assessment of tiers is relatively valid. Of course, things may change in 5 years, but for now it seems about right... Fri, Oct 2, 2009 2:36 PM
-
142. A comprehensive, innovative approach to high capacity transit is required. There will never be enough roads to accommodate cars and there never should be. We must adopt a new vision for transportation to build stronger communities. High capacity transit is at the core of this. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 12:56 PM
-
143. More focus on the westside of the region - additional HCT options are needed in Hillsboro and the surrounding area to better connect the major employers to HCT (Intel, Solarworld & the rest of the employment corridor on Evergreen). Fri, Oct 2, 2009 12:35 PM
-
144. I am especially in favor of tranist along 99 through Tigard to Sherwood. And adding more service times to WES would dramatically improve ridership, I think. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:53 AM
-
145. I think your focus on tiers is about right---I would think a major light rail line to follow I205 would be a top priority and take care/help your near term priorities. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:23 AM
-
146. No way to judge without performance infromation adn impact on the region's economy Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:14 AM
-
147. Americans in general don't view high capacity transit. It is a waste of money to invest in this if people won't use it--More needs to be done to make high capacity systems seem safe and clean. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 10:59 AM

250 responses per page

answered question 206

skipped question 275

4. Comments:

148. self-sustaining, transit is not Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:58 AM
-
149. We simply must have light rail connected to Oregon City. Especially with the new developments being built in The Cove area... if we don't have light rail, everyone out there is going to be driving. Do we want that? Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:47 AM
-
150. If light rail is only the equivalent of one half of a lane of freeway, this makes no sense at all. If we need an additional two lanes, then you need to build four light transit lines. And lastly, national studies show that the best relief in congestion has only been about 3%. This is not cost effective. The most cost effective plan would be to put jobs where the people live. Reduce commuting and the existing roads would be much better off. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:20 AM
-
151. Focusing on the top tier will help to get those systems in place faster, but long-term considerations should be given to completing the network to other metropolitan areas in the next phase. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:08 AM
-
152. This focus does not deal with the greatest need which is transportation to Washington Co. The road system needs attention. A tunnel through the west hills would provide a good all weather option and allow people a safe route. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:54 AM
-
153. The only place that need a transit system now is on the west side of town. 217, beaverton area. if not going to focus in that area than repair and maintain bridges and roadways. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:44 AM
-
154. It is important to link the commuter with the suburbs but the outer rings need to be linked as well. An easy commute along the boundary of the community would be nice. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:34 AM
-
155. communities want and use fast track transportation. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:32 AM
-
156. Again, the problem you have, infrastructure needs to be put in to service the automobile traffic or METRO will risk putting people in areas outside of the METRO area, not everyone is going to want to live in a high density enviroment. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:26 AM
-
157. All-day service on WES would be wonderful. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 6:47 AM
-
158. Incorporate more homes above businesses. Make driving to work less common. Just make sure the roads are driveable. No need to have super hiways running to and fro. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 3:58 AM
-
159. The current transit system should revamp their budget to Not depend on raising fares to the public ,instead they need to find money in the current buget Thu, Oct 1, 2009 9:10 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 206

skipped question 275

4. Comments:

not to Expend.

160. Improving bike and walk access to these facilities should be included in total project scope and costs. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 8:52 PM

161. The focus is wrongly on "high capacity" transit when alternatives such as improved bus service and faster travel times have yet to be explored fully. High capacity should also include increased bus service. We have few bus corridors with service even approaching every 10 minutes or better. Improving capacity should also mean adding service to create rapid bus corridors with fewer stops, faster travel times, bus-only lanes, frequency improvements, etc.. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 8:19 PM

162. High capacity transit should -replace- lanes of existing car traffic, NOT be in addition to existing auto lanes. This is going to be one of the only ways to increase ridership and reduce auto congestion. The forthcoming Portland to Milwaukie light rail line fails to do this, so McLoughlin (99E) will continue to be congested. The alignment should have been put onto 99E instead. If a transit corridor like Powell hwy 26) to Gresham or Barbur (99W) is chosen, then cars need to be given less priority and rapid buses or trains given more priority. I'm sure Metro has a list of 2nd tier transit corridors to consider adding to this list if more funds are available. Most importantly, high capacity transit should not revolve around development. "Transit oriented development" is a lame way to give "encourage" developers (through tax breaks and and shady dealings) to build bad projects like "The Round" in Beaverton. Instead of "Transit oriented development", we should be building future high capacity transit lines to/from where the major job centers currently exist (Hwy 224 in Clack county, Airportway, Kruse Way/217 and so on) to/from exiting town centers or major neighborhoods, then let the developers decide if they want to develop, instead of giving developers incentives. Build high capacity transit based on what is good for the masses, not what is good for the developers! Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:54 PM

WES is a waist of money and will likely never get enough ridership to cover it's costs. At some point, we need to at least cover most or all of the operating costs in order to make it worth doing. Sometimes government needs to run more like private business and actually use income to pay expenses rather than relying on taxpayers to cover the cost of ineffective systems used by the few who ride it.

163. don't upgrade WES - we need busses Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:43 PM

164. We need much more public transportation. We have to get people out of their single occupancy cars, which are warming the planet and endangering life as Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:22 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 206

skipped question 275

4. Comments:

we know it.

165. There are limitations to light rail, commuter trail, and rapid streetcars. A better strategy would focus on bus rapid transit, due to its higher flexibility (light rail, etc is subject to frequent interruptions in service, for example). Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:35 PM

166. Portland needs a subway system. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:21 PM

167. Light rail I can support, but he streetcar, commuter rail, I cannot. Stick to ONE mode to make it work. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 5:58 PM

168. I don't have the time to investigate this issue. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:57 PM

169. only if 'high capacity' means increased bus lines Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:54 PM

(can't open 'high capacity' pdf)

170. A comment from this life long freight train engineer would remind you that trains and people and cars can't be in the same place at the same time. I'd like to see underground or overhead trains because the road capacity isn't decreased, and chances for accidents is less, and track maintenance is less because of less exposure to the ground &/or elements. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:15 PM

171. Development decisions should be made around capacity exclusively, consequences should be introduced for development of areas with no access to the larger system.s Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:14 PM

172. Ridership on WES has proven disappointing. Connection and total transit times make its use too slow. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:02 PM

173. We should be "fast-tracking" rail transit -- both metro and intercity. Extend MAX to Forest Grove. Extend WES system to Newberg and McMinnville. Start building Portland to Sherwood while Milwaukie line is under construction. Extend streetcar lines in SE and NE Portland. Buy more buses. Consider larger (flexible buses for major corridors. We're going to need all that and more. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:45 PM

174. It is essential to reduce car traffic and increase public transportation by high capacity transit. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:12 PM

175. In order to meet climate change goals, we need more higher capacity transit. We need to start building these lines at a faster rate than once every 5-7 years. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:09 PM

176. I can't make a decision on this question. Your links do not work(about 50% of them). Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:05 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 206

skipped question 275

4. Comments:

177. Mass transit will only be really effective when transit times are improved. High capacity is only a part of a successful mass transit system. Drop WES and build light rail that integrates with the rest of the MAX system. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:04 PM
-
178. I think WES is an example of a good solution using existing infrastructure and right of way. How is the useage level? I live in SW and trimet has reduced the 1 route. I have no further interest in taking transit because it takes too long and is inconvenient Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:03 PM
-
179. Barbur Boulevard needs new options soon. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:00 PM
-
180. Living south of Portland I would like to see a network that reaches down to Oregon City along both sides of the Willamette before providing another line to the eastside which the Portland to Gresham line would seem to do. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:57 PM
-
181. Put more emphasis on transit that support short trips and local community building rather than longer regional commutes. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:53 PM
-
182. I think the bus is important, but I do not support rapid transit unless the crime stops on the rail system. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:53 PM
-
183. I hope WES works out- something I couldn't use Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:47 PM
-
184. It is too costly, has no ability to pay for itself without significant federal subsidy. Large Transit investments offer little in the way of actual rapid transit comparitively, and offer little no flexibility to serve changing demands. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:46 PM
-
185. Less stops longer runs Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:41 PM
-
186. More suburb-to-suburb high capacity transit is needed. SOOOO many of us work outside the downtown area and thinking in that old central-city hub mentality is outdated. PLEASE plan on more locations for suburbanites to park. Many times I've tried to take MAX to Portland or the airport but the Sunset Transit Center is full, forcing me to drive the entire way. A bit more planning and floors on the parking structures would go a long way to greater utilization of our rail systems. The WES also suffers from this exact same problem. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:41 PM
-
187. Again, listen to the people that voted against spending on mass transit Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:37 PM
-
188. There is no need for HCTS on Powel Blvd. In addition, busses as a means of regional transport, as in the Banfield Flyer, should be a priority. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:36 PM
-
189. PLEASE get some rail moving north/south and cars off I-5 Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:35 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 206

skipped question 275

4. Comments:

- | | | |
|------|---|----------------------------|
| 190. | Service upgrades very important, and should include assistance to bus service as well as top tier transit. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:33 PM |
| 191. | See previous comments | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:29 PM |
| 192. | There should be funds and energy invested in public transit towards Lake Oswego/West Linn and Hwy 43. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:28 PM |
| 193. | Higher transit speed is necessary - i.e., express MAX trains | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:24 PM |
| 194. | Investment in projects like WES are a wast as nobody rides it. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:22 PM |
| 195. | easy high speed mass transit is one half of the two pronged action necessary to greatly reducing personal automobile use. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:22 PM |
| 196. | should consider high capacity & faster service from Tualatin through Lake Oswego to Milwaukie and downtown Portland with several stops at key population centers | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:20 PM |
| 197. | Again, you put emphasis on specific routes, but don't do enough to build the connecting routes to those specific inflexible routes. It also takes time to build ridership routes. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:19 PM |
| 198. | We are no where close to having the demographics to afford or need these rail projects. It is a total waste of public monies. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:16 PM |
| 199. | Although, number three is a waste of money. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:02 PM |
| 200. | More rail, fewer buses, using existing right of way. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 1:52 PM |
| 201. | Invest in rail to move freight and get it off the highways wherever possible. | Tue, Sep 29, 2009 10:59 PM |
| 202. | More money for other routes. Actually, if it weren't for war spending there would be enough for all the projects. | Mon, Sep 28, 2009 5:24 PM |
| 203. | While MAX and trolleys are nice, buses are more cost effective and flexible. When bus lines prove themselves then they can be made into fixed rail transit. | Mon, Sep 28, 2009 3:37 PM |
| 204. | Addition of MAX lines should be the number one priority. | Mon, Sep 28, 2009 2:46 PM |
| 205. | CTC to Oregon City | Thu, Sep 17, 2009 5:59 AM |
| 206. | You need to divert your focus to Freeway, Highway and Road development, improvement and maintenance. | Wed, Sep 16, 2009 6:43 PM |

250 responses per page

answered question 206

skipped question 275

5. If more funds were invested in high capacity transit, what other types of investment should be decreased?

**Response
Count**

 [Hide replies](#)

188

- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| 1. None. | Fri, Oct 16, 2009 7:38 AM |
| 2. I am opposed to more investment in high capacity transit. Except for the Highway 99-Sherwood option, I don't think the others should be a high priority. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:20 PM |
| 3. Expanding UGB. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:44 PM |
| 4. Common sense tells us that if more people are using public transit, then less people are using the highways & roads. Perhaps the demand of the public simply dictates fund allocation. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:36 PM |
| 5. tax breaks for companies to stay in the city. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 4:23 PM |
| 6. . . . too much \$\$ is wasted on Admin which are overpaid and do absolutely nothing. The public is not as ignorant as you may think. One quarter of Admin employees are useless. We shouldn't be wasting transit \$\$'s when the middle class folks are struggling. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:45 PM |
| 7. New highways & roads. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:28 PM |
| 8. While bridges and roads must be maintained, expansion in most/many cases will be a stranded assets | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:06 PM |
| 9. At least for the near term, tax abatement on TOD projects whose only qualification is that the lot is near a light-rail station. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 12:28 PM |
| 10. I believe freeway improvement. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 11:48 AM |
| 11. I do not want more funds invested in high capacity transit due to high criminal and gang activity on transit systems. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 11:19 AM |
| 12. New expensive roads. Let developers pay their share of cost for expansion. They got rich during the boom years. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:50 AM |
| 13. Why ask an either or question all the time? With all the college graduates available for intern work, that is the best question you can come up with? Yesterday, we paid the Oregon DMV a fee for our teen ager to obtain a driver's permit. With so many pages/info from the DMV manual on teen driving risks, why aren't the fees for teen driving five or ten times as much as the paltry | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:07 AM |

250 responses per page

answered question 188

skipped question 293

5. If more funds were invested in high capacity transit, what other types of investment should be decreased?

\$22.50 fee I paid? And a sliding income scale for fees can not be used?

14.	Zero, we should actually strip funding from 'high capacity transit'. It's a ridiculous buzz word by the way and an obvious attempt to sugar coat Portland's ridiculous interest in trollies, bus lines and max trains.	Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:28 AM
15.	Work comes before play and transportaiton that is only availble seasonally. So bikes, walks etc come last.	Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:26 AM
16.	Funds for high capacity transit should be decreased. It has no economical or environmental advantages. High capacity transit will be outdated long before we see economic or environmental returns.	Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:25 AM
17.	I believe that the highway investment should be decreased in order to provide additional investment in high capacity transit. As I previously stated, I believe widening the highways will encourage usage, leading to increased congestion, no less, so moving those funds to high capacity transit would help resolve the problem of highway congestion.	Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:48 AM
18.	From low capacity transit funds/resources.	Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:29 AM
19.	Better overall planning of the cities, MUCH better planning for the future, a dedicated route from I5 to HWY 26 via the area of Hwy219, a Western Bypass and extending the WES line to Salem.	Thu, Oct 15, 2009 7:08 AM
20.	No more money for high capacity transit	Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:24 AM
21.	Don't add more roads! Work on existing roads.	Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:23 AM
22.	I think focusing on a more flexible form of mass transit is wiser. Your questions are shaping the answers as you want.	Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:20 AM
23.	Buses, buses, and more buses. STOP FUNDING RAIL!!!!	Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:32 AM
24.	not sure	Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:23 AM
25.	No keep as is. Roads, bridges, etc are also needed	Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:11 PM
26.	Highway expansion.	Wed, Oct 14, 2009 7:54 PM
27.	Highway projects	Wed, Oct 14, 2009 6:15 PM
28.	Funding on the East side of the river should be decreased because the East side has sidewalks, paved streets, and bike lanes already. It is time to focus on the SW and replace existing infrastructure for future growth. Growing without doing so will put a tremendous strain on the livability or our neighborhood.	Wed, Oct 14, 2009 4:56 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 188

skipped question 293

5. If more funds were invested in high capacity transit, what other types of investment should be decreased?

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------------------------|
| 29. | Base expenditures on a cost benefit basis. 100 million for 800 riders on WES does not seem to be a very good benefit for the cost. How many cars does a lane of road carry? 1000 an hour or so. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 3:32 PM |
| 30. | The Columbia River Crossing mega bridge and highway expansion | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 3:26 PM |
| 31. | Roads and highways. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 1:59 PM |
| 32. | Big dollar bridges and widening highways. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 1:43 PM |
| 33. | Wait on high capacity to outlying areas like Sherwood and Wilsonville. Focus on improving the core first and then expand. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 12:53 PM |
| 34. | Maintain current infrastructure; avoid expansion of pavement. DO NOT increase numbers of lanes on roadways (e.g., Columbia River Crossing). | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 12:16 PM |
| 35. | Highway and roadway expansion. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 11:43 AM |
| 36. | Less highways. Mass transit needs to be the first choice for anyone commuting. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 10:43 AM |
| 37. | Highway widening for faster vehicles and trucks. Trucks should have their own roadway system, and train transport should be emphasized over making more roads for trucks. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:37 AM |
| 38. | More funds should not go into HCT, moneys from there need to go to maintaining internal and improving internal (within UGB) infrastructure so its adequate to support the density that HCT should bring. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 7:24 AM |
| 39. | Road building | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 9:11 PM |
| 40. | There is no congestion here just speeding and large backed up que when the high school down the street has something going on., | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:00 PM |
| 41. | Highways and roads and the CRC, definitely. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 6:47 PM |
| 42. | Highways and other investments in favor of non-freight, non-transit automobiles. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 6:25 PM |
| 43. | Highways and roads...don't do any more "modernization" projects! | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 4:26 PM |
| 44. | We should stop trying to solve problems of automobile congestion. Those problems will be eliminated as automobiles become too expensive to operate. The congestion problems on the roads today tend to encourage people to change their behavior in ways that promote sustainability. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 4:22 PM |

250 responses per page

answered question 188

skipped question 293

5. If more funds were invested in high capacity transit, what other types of investment should be decreased?

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 45. Highways | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 4:14 PM |
| 46. Investment in more roads including their widening. With Peak Oil staring us in the face we need to cut our dependence on this high pollution fuel that is one of the major causes of increased levels of CO2 and resulting climate change scenarios. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 3:31 PM |
| 47. investment levels can remain the same (road maintenance seems to have a few years of catching up to do) but the region needs to do more to discourage non-commercial road use in town, starting with a congestion fee for peak hour road use. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 3:29 PM |
| 48. Jobs of the Tri-met/other transit management should be reduced to save funds. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 2:54 PM |
| 49. Highway expansion. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 2:48 PM |
| 50. New highways | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 2:02 PM |
| 51. More for public transit and biking; less for highways! | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 12:59 PM |
| 52. Roads | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 12:39 PM |
| 53. more funds focused on maximizing capacity and dependability. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:31 AM |
| 54. I would decrease general road projects, but not highway projects. I believe we need to maintain highway investments that are focused on safety and velocity (but not additional lanes for capacity alone), but I believe that we hold roads -- especially local and neighborhood roads -- to a far too high standard. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:08 AM |
| 55. More funds should not be invested in high capacity transit until current roadways are improved. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 10:28 AM |
| 56. McLoughin corridor | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 10:21 AM |
| 57. slow street car | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 9:31 AM |
| 58. Funding for creation of new roads & highways for automobiles benifit. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:38 AM |
| 59. This is the typical "portland politics" attitude again. Decrease transit funding - billions of \$ for a few miles of transport for a tiny percent of the populace is wrong. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:19 AM |
| 60. good question (note minor typo in the first line below) | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:06 AM |
| 61. Highway and the CRC. Toll them, both to provide any funds spent on their maintenance or improvement, and to discourage SOV trips. This will also make | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 6:04 AM |

250 responses per page

answered question 188

skipped question 293

5. If more funds were invested in high capacity transit, what other types of investment should be decreased?

the appeal of high capacity transit more apparent.

- | | | |
|-----|---|---------------------------|
| 62. | Decrease funding on highways. If limiting or slowing commercial travel on our freeways are of concern, give freight traffic dedicated lanes, something similar to a carpool lane. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 9:27 PM |
| 63. | Highways, (non-bridge) roads. No flexible funds should be spent on highway projects. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 9:02 PM |
| 64. | I would not support such a proposal. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:49 PM |
| 65. | No new highways, use and improve what we have. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:09 PM |
| 66. | Road expansion projects and the Columbia River Crossing | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:43 PM |
| 67. | Spend the money wisely by doing a cost/benefit relationship. If buses are more cost effective, expand that system. If light rail is more cost effective, expand that system. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:26 PM |
| 68. | Adding lanes to existing freeways feeds the 'build it, they will come' syndrome. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:06 PM |
| 69. | There should be a decrease in the amount of money that goes into expanding roads for car travel definitely no CRC. I know that public transportation is not profitable but it creates a great deal more jobs than road building, keeps more money in people's pockets, is good for local businesses, and reduces pollution. Driving a car is too easy and taking public transportation is too difficult. I suggest making public transportation more accessible and making driving less accessible in order to balance the playing field. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 6:34 PM |
| 70. | I don't use light rail because it takes 30 minutes by bus to reach it. If you increase \$ for this mode of travel and decrease others, you will end up making transportation and housing less affordable. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 5:49 PM |
| 71. | New roads. Just maintain the present ones or replace with bike/walk lanes and light rail or street cars. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:30 PM |
| 72. | automobile | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:21 PM |
| 73. | Funding for motor-vehicle projects and the accompanying road and bridge improvements should be radically decreased. This would include a significantly scaled back CRC project, limiting several lanes built while keeping rail and biking plans intact. Or, alternatively, scrap the whole CRC project, and build a bike and rail dedicated bridge instead at a greatly reduced cost to the region, freeing up billions for alternate-transportation projects. Less people in cars = less need for an expanded I-5 bridge. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:10 PM |

250 responses per page

answered question 188

skipped question 293

5. If more funds were invested in high capacity transit, what other types of investment should be decreased?

74. As stated previously, wasteful subsidies for additional highway capacity should be substantially reduced.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:45 PM
75. Stop investing in roads and facilities that increase expensive urban sprawl, such as highway projects to the Happy Valley area.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:24 PM
76. Roads and single-traveler options should be discouraged.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:58 PM
77. roads and highways	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:53 PM
78. Private vehicle projects such as highway expansion (adding lanes or building new highways). The CRC needs to be reconsidered in this way as well.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:40 PM
79. Road widening, CRC, MAX expansion (hate to say it, but MAX is hugely expensive and once in place, not flexible the way a bus system is).	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:14 PM
80. Road and highway funds.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:09 PM
81. new Highway projects. Please spend highway \$\$ on	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 11:37 AM
82. Highways	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 11:00 AM
83. Road widening.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:16 AM
84. This should not happen!!!	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:42 AM
85. Less focus on bikes. Too much money to benefit so few!	Sun, Oct 11, 2009 8:44 AM
86. Limiting expansion of road and concentrate on repair, upgrades and safety.	Sun, Oct 11, 2009 5:20 AM
87. I would suggest that those of you who are reading the results of this survey should do so with many grains of salt, given the slanted questions in it, like the one I'm answering right now: "If more funds were invested in high capacity transit, what other types of investment should be decreased?"	Sun, Oct 11, 2009 1:22 AM
88. Highways	Sat, Oct 10, 2009 1:00 PM
89. See previous suggestions	Sat, Oct 10, 2009 9:11 AM
90. DO NOT Decrease highway spending.	Sat, Oct 10, 2009 6:47 AM
91. Federal funds for high speed light rail would make build out of WES less important.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 2:34 PM
92. Widening highways	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:57 PM
93. more money into transit is the wrong direction, period.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:53 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 188

skipped question 293

5. If more funds were invested in high capacity transit, what other types of investment should be decreased?

94.	Funding for building new roads should be decreased to further investments in high capacity transit.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:13 PM
95.	I do not recommend this.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:00 PM
96.	Expansion of roads and highways to accommodate increase in car and truck traffic. Unless a system is developed that makes public transportation convenient for all the cycle of highway expansion will always continue contributing to a variety of negative social factors.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 12:23 PM
97.	Less public subsidy of half-baked mass transit ideas. Even if much is federal funding, it still comes down to massive public assistance funding and not efficiently targeted.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:40 AM
98.	catering in government meetings? i don't know what about potluck style.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:38 AM
99.	Vehicles that compete with taxi cabs and towncars. Metro should not be sending short buses into neighborhoods.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:36 AM
100.	Building new roads or related infrastructure. We need to rethink how we get around our neighborhoods and how communities are planned.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:24 AM
101.	Highways fostering sprawl.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:10 AM
102.	I would need to research this more, as I truly believe all areas are important to the city.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:59 AM
103.	Subsidies to sports arenas.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:50 AM
104.	roads	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:40 AM
105.	Roads....? I don't know that's tough isn't it. But probably roads.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:40 AM
106.	Road improvements within the urbanized area.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:37 AM
107.	Scaling back funds for the CRC comes to mind.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:32 AM
108.	Decrease investment in new roads. First and foremost, cut all new road projects that would adversely impact natural resources. A perfect example is the Sunnybrook Extension, which would harm an extraordinarily rare old growth ecosystem. OSU botanists have estimated the age of some trees to be near 250 years old. That is, the trees are an intact remnant of the ecosystem that was present before european settlement.	Thu, Oct 8, 2009 6:28 PM
109.	Roads and highways	Thu, Oct 8, 2009 8:45 AM

250 responses per page

answered question 188

skipped question 293

5. If more funds were invested in high capacity transit, what other types of investment should be decreased?

110.	Columbia river crossing uber highway to sprawlville	Thu, Oct 8, 2009 8:38 AM
111.	highway funding	Thu, Oct 8, 2009 7:42 AM
112.	Please do not reduce funding of roads and highways to increase funding for transit. You have clearly acknowledged the backlog of maintenance that our current roads require. Please eliminate the backlog.	Wed, Oct 7, 2009 12:55 PM
113.	highways	Tue, Oct 6, 2009 4:03 PM
114.	Highways	Tue, Oct 6, 2009 12:35 PM
115.	Will we still be looking at highways as good transportation solutions in 50 years if by then oil production has peaked and gasoline-powered private autos and trucks are no longer as viable?	Tue, Oct 6, 2009 11:52 AM
116.	Stop adding capacity in the form of additional lanes / highway widening, this only adds to future congestion for auto traffic,	Tue, Oct 6, 2009 11:20 AM
117.	High capacity transit is a money-sucking monster that will never be satisfied. The hunger is endless. Pull away from these ambitious plans before we are stuck with an infrastructure we can't afford to maintain. Stick with adding bus service, its cheaper than building light rail. And there is nothing wrong with driving on Powell Blvd. . . just leave it the way it is and don't spend any money on it right now.	Mon, Oct 5, 2009 9:15 PM
118.	Widening of existing arterial roads.	Mon, Oct 5, 2009 3:45 PM
119.	Highways, bikes, regional trails.	Mon, Oct 5, 2009 12:49 PM
120.	highways	Mon, Oct 5, 2009 10:31 AM
121.	None	Mon, Oct 5, 2009 8:27 AM
122.	Instead of thinking what should be decreased, I think it is fair to think about how bicycles can be taxed as trails and routes are built for them.	Mon, Oct 5, 2009 8:19 AM
123.	Bikes	Mon, Oct 5, 2009 7:19 AM
124.	I think other investments, ie bike trails, should trump transit. How many times have I seen trains and buses mostly empty? My tax dollars at work? There must be a better way.	Mon, Oct 5, 2009 5:50 AM
125.	Widening highwys	Sun, Oct 4, 2009 2:32 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 188

skipped question 293

5. If more funds were invested in high capacity transit, what other types of investment should be decreased?

- | | | |
|------|--|---------------------------|
| 126. | Adequate parking is needed to reach the fullest capacity, People do not like to transfer. | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 6:51 PM |
| 127. | The entire process is corrupt. This will change everything people moved here to enjoy. NO HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT! | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 4:24 PM |
| 128. | Road wiening | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 1:52 PM |
| 129. | Not sure. | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 11:37 AM |
| 130. | Don't do it. | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 11:10 AM |
| 131. | Denser high-capacity service closer to the core, rather than to the periphery of the UGB. | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 6:57 AM |
| 132. | Decrease funds for new or expanding highways designed for automobiles. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:29 PM |
| 133. | Additional lanes on freeways where three lanes exist. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 5:30 PM |
| 134. | As above, the high capacity transit expenditures should be delayed other than to secure the routes. One thing that should be supported is interregional high speed rail and to try to do everything possible to promote a "West Coast Route" from San Diego to Vancouver BC with dual tracks and overpasses and some stops at cities such as Sherwood, Lake Oswego, Milwaukie/Oregon City. Metro should strive to provide this high capacity high speed rail as a priority so that connection with Eugene and Seattle is already provided if and when that goes forward. I would stress the dual tracks and overpasses, high overpasses like BART in the Bay Area, completely safe with no pedestrian or vehicle at-grade crossings. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 2:44 PM |
| 135. | I would connect Clackamas TC and Milwaukie or Milwaukee to Oregon City. I would also try and get a truck route from N Wilsonville through the Tonquin corridor to Tual-Sher Hwy and to 99W. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 2:36 PM |
| 136. | Less on building new roads. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 12:56 PM |
| 137. | roads & bridges | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 12:35 PM |
| 138. | Low capacity transit to include the "feel good" walking/bike paths that "really do not move much if any traffic" for the dollars spent! | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:23 AM |
| 139. | Off-peak service. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 10:14 AM |
| 140. | funds should be invested in what makes fiscal sense and is proven to support and grow the economy, that is where we are and have struggled in the past | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:58 AM |

250 responses per page

answered question 188

skipped question 293

5. If more funds were invested in high capacity transit, what other types of investment should be decreased?

- | | | |
|------|---|---------------------------|
| 141. | Let me say this: for some areas, adding a bus is easier than putting in a streetcar, and is a much more flexible choice. Why I don't request that for Oregon City: it would be fine, in fact, helpful for some of the new neighborhoods, but the area needs connection to the rest of the region, speedy, easy light rail service. It brings in reach the airport, many places of employment, art and culture (libraries, the zoo, downtown museums), the Rose Garden... it also then relieves traffic on I-205 and in the McLoughlin corridor. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:47 AM |
| 142. | No other investment should be decrease. In fact the investment in mass transit should be decreased. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:20 AM |
| 143. | Highways, absolutely. Funds for those projects should be raised completely with tolling and gasoline taxes. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:08 AM |
| 144. | No increase in funds should be considered | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:54 AM |
| 145. | metro wages | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:44 AM |
| 146. | trails | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:32 AM |
| 147. | More funds should be invested in the current system not high capacity transit. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:26 AM |
| 148. | Less money needs to be spent on transit, because we need more capacity for freight. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 5:44 AM |
| 149. | Not sure. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 3:58 AM |
| 150. | highways and auto bridges | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 10:04 PM |
| 151. | Decrease funding for new roads or new road capacity. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 8:52 PM |
| 152. | highways. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 8:19 PM |
| 153. | Roads and Bridges, Highways and TOD | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:54 PM |
| 154. | Highways and anything that primarily benefits cars | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:22 PM |
| 155. | Fewer funds should be invested in high capacity transit and more funds delivered to increasing frequency-of-service issues. Ensure that the current transportation system is able to run on a 24 hour schedule, to accommodate the growing numbers of night-shift users/workers. Provide higher subsidization of employer-based transportation/car-pooling incentives, & low-income passengers. In addition, bathrooms, televisions and/both coin-operated vending snack machines should be made available for the purpose of increasing revenue and adding amenities and/both modern convenience for | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:35 PM |

250 responses per page

answered question 188

skipped question 293

5. If more funds were invested in high capacity transit, what other types of investment should be decreased?

commuters.

156.	wideneng of roads	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:21 PM
157.	Streetcar, commuter rail, bike lanes	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 5:58 PM
158.	expanding highways	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 5:41 PM
159.	slow the development of rail lines in favor of more, and more creative, bus lines. be 'green' in the ECONOMICS	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:54 PM
160.	Sorry, I don't have an answer here other than to look harder for wasted monies.	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:20 PM
161.	I'm not a fan of WES because I believe as the price of gasoline increases, commuting distances will decrease. Powell, Barbur Blvd., and Vancouver should have high capacity, high speed priority.	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:15 PM
162.	roads, bridges, and high capacity avenues	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:14 PM
163.	Stop pouring money into widening highways and boulevards. They are plenty wide enough for the traffic that will be using them.	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:45 PM
164.	Highways	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:19 PM
165.	Highway and bridges (accommodating automobiles) construction.	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:12 PM
166.	HCT investment is low-carbon replacement capacity for highways.	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:09 PM
167.	No money should be spent on streetcars. They are too slow. Buses are better for inner city transit. A subway for MAX through downtown Portland is critical.	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:04 PM
168.	Work in downtown Portland link the couplet that adams is pushing. What a waste! How about decreasing funding on the bus mall. Again, what a waste.	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:03 PM
169.	Highway capacity expansion.	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:00 PM
170.	Decrease nvestments that increase the urban boundary. I think we need to keep our urban footprint contained	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:57 PM
171.	More investment is needed in conventional capacity expansion.	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:46 PM
172.	Busses! I see so many that have only 1 or 2 passengers or are totally empty. This system needs to be right-sized!	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:41 PM
173.	good question, no easy answers	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:35 PM
174.	Highways	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:33 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 188

skipped question 293

5. If more funds were invested in high capacity transit, what other types of investment should be decreased?

175. See previous comments Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:29 PM

176. Reduce funds that go to increase capacity for single occupancy vehicles Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:24 PM

177. Road building and maintenance. Switch 25% of all surface roads to light duty human powered transportation ONLY. Keeping large trucks off roads will allow them to last 4 or 5 times longer. You also may be able to replace asphalt with some kind of permeable surface if it no longer has to be able to support tons of weight. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:22 PM

178. roads Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:20 PM

179. High capacity transit serves a small area of the metro area, yet has very high costs. It is nice to have this available -- if you live and work near the route. That does not cover a very large percentage of the metro population. It looks and sounds nice, operates smoothly, but does not serve the majority of the population! Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:19 PM

180. This would be a very serious mistake. You actually have no idea of how people commute or what they like and dislike. You just think you do. I am an advocate for public transportation. Having spent over 20 years in it. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:16 PM

181. highway construction Thu, Oct 1, 2009 1:52 PM

182. Highways Tue, Sep 29, 2009 10:59 PM

183. Auto roads and infrastructure. Congestion pricing / tolls should be placed on roads to raise money for all transportation, but especially alternative transportation. Mon, Sep 28, 2009 3:37 PM

184. Building of new roads and highways should be severely limited. Mon, Sep 28, 2009 2:46 PM

Note: the "Learn more about the high capacity transit tiers" link above is broken.

185. Highway expansion. Wed, Sep 23, 2009 8:20 AM

186. Sidewalks and bike Thu, Sep 17, 2009 5:59 AM

187. None, funds should not be invested in any further high capacity transit. Wed, Sep 16, 2009 6:43 PM

188. As mentioned previously, highway expansion could be decreased. Though safety is a factor here. Tue, Sep 15, 2009 8:02 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 188

skipped question 293

6. The Regional Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) plan includes a many strategies to make the most of our investment in the region’s transportation system. When compared to traditional capital investments such as adding new transit service, building new roads or additional lanes, TSMO strategies offer high returns for a comparatively low cost, and can delay or remove the need for additional costly capital-intensive investments. As proposed, the TSMO plan includes more than \$725 million in proposed investments for the period of 2010 to 2020.

[>Learn more about transportation systems management and operations](#)

How would you rate the importance of each of these strategies to better address congestion and increase efficiency on our transportation system?

	extremely important	very important	somewhat important	not very important	not at all important	Response Count
Keeping current roads, bridges, transit and trails in good condition	49.4% (176)	38.2% (136)	10.4% (37)	1.1% (4)	0.8% (3)	356
Increasing smart technology like signal priority at intersections and more incident and travel time information on the highway system to manage congestion	30.4% (106)	31.2% (109)	26.9% (94)	8.6% (30)	2.9% (10)	349
Managing access to major streets and highways	17.1% (60)	32.0% (112)	38.3% (134)	9.4% (33)	3.1% (11)	350
Educating about and implementing incentives like youth bus pass and employer programs to encourage biking, walking, carpools, vanpools and transit use	36.9% (130)	19.0% (67)	24.1% (85)	11.9% (42)	8.0% (28)	352
Improving traffic incident detection and clearance times on highway, major streets and transit networks	17.9% (63)	34.9% (123)	35.8% (126)	9.4% (33)	2.0% (7)	352
Providing more travel information to people and businesses, including message signs on highways, radio alerts, ODOT’s Tripcheck.com and TriMet’s Transit Tracker	13.0% (46)	21.8% (77)	42.8% (151)	16.7% (59)	5.7% (20)	353
Considering tolls and other pricing strategies	27.4% (96)	23.4% (82)	20.0% (70)	12.3% (43)	16.9% (59)	350
					answered question	356
					skipped question	125

6. The Regional Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) plan includes a many strategies to make the most of our investment in the region's transportation system. When compared to traditional capital investments such as adding new transit service, building new roads or additional lanes, TSMO strategies offer high returns for a comparatively low cost, and can delay or remove the need for additional costly capital-intensive investments. As proposed, the TSMO plan includes more than \$725 million in proposed investments for the period of 2010 to 2020.

[>Learn more about transportation systems management and operations](#)

How would you rate the importance of each of these strategies to better address congestion and increase efficiency on our transportation system ?

<p>Increasing parking fees, shared parking for multiple uses and price discounts for carpools or short-term parking in centers, downtowns, main streets and areas served by high quality transit.</p>	<p>25.7% (90)</p>	<p>24.0% (84)</p>	<p>20.3% (71)</p>	<p>14.9% (52)</p>	<p>15.1% (53)</p>	<p>350</p>
<i>answered question</i>						356
<i>skipped question</i>						125

7. Comments:

**Response
Count**

 [Hide replies](#) 143

1. Since the single most effective thing to get people out of their cars and on public transit is high gas prices, and since the public outcry would probably make tolls/fee impossible, our leaders need to approach spending for automobiles very carefully. Even if they don't believe in Peak Oil, they have to admit that we cannot continue to live the way we do now indefinitely. Gasoline prices will continue to go up -- prepare for the needed capacity. Tri-Met won't.

Fri, Oct 16, 2009 2:48 AM

2. I am not in favor of policies that attempt to drive transportation initiatives by punishing "bad" behavior (i.e. tolls, metering lights, etc are forms of punishment).

Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:31 PM

250 responses per page

answered question **143**

skipped question **338**

7. Comments:

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------------------------|
| 3. | how about just more lanes? | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:26 PM |
| 4. | Build Roads that people cand drive on. Quit trying to control people's lives from cradle to grave. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:12 PM |
| 5. | .Increase smart technology saves gas and time. There are CPU's at every signaled intersection yet they are poorly managed. High school kids could figure out a better system and . . too much \$\$ is wasted on Admin which are overpaid and do absolutely nothing. The public is not as ignorant as you may think. One quarter of Admin employees are useless. We shouldn't be wasting transit \$\$'s when the middle class folks are struggling. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:45 PM |
| 6. | As transportation fuels become very expensive, and then come to be in short supply, traffic congestion will cease and any investments made to deal with it will be stranded. Intelligent investments, like signal timing and re-signaling (blinking yellow turn arrows, for instance) are smart, but beyond that, these choices are all based on an assumption of unlimited supplies of cheap fossil fuels going forward. Bad assumption. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:28 PM |
| 7. | How about requiring adequate parking (and parking space size regulations) when new buidlings go up or change hands? Sure, we'd all like to think that people won't drive, but they will. Charging more for parking will help to ensure that people stay in the suburbs. Parking around transit should be FREE if you want people to use it! | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:17 PM |
| 8. | Adding more fees to the people of Portland right now is not a good idea. People are struggling!! I still think if the state would overhaul our welfare system we could collect more than enough money than we need. Don't get me wrong welfare is an extremely important system that should be there for people down on their luck, BUT make each and every one of them take a urine test to qualify, make them reapply at intervals and another urine test to continue to receive benefits. We the working people have to, so should they!!! | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:43 PM |
| 9. | Free parking spots for Bicycles city wide. No bike fees. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:30 PM |
| 10. | I'm prioritizing travel information to call attention to a serious problem in current TriMet policy. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 12:38 PM |

About five years ago, TriMet announced a program to post schedules at every bus stop. This was a great idea, long overdue. It makes a real difference whether one will have to wait eight minutes or forty-eight. Not knowing this sort of thing is a *serious* disincentive to using bus service.

250 responses per page

answered question 143

skipped question 338

7. Comments:

At present TriMet would like to imagine that the problem is solved by providing real-time information by telephone. This is based on the assumption that everyone has a cell phone and can just call from any bus stop. If they are going to make that assumption, then why not also assume that everyone has a car and will use it for all travel (after all, our society in general does make that very assumption!). Then they can just cut *all* bus lines, at an enormous saving to the budget. No, we don't all have or want cell phones, and their existence does not obviate the need for printed information at the bus stop.

On top of which, TriMet is not serious about that either. We know that, because it does not post 1) the ID number of the stop, and 2) the telephone number to call, at every stop. I am not arguing against real-time information by phone; it's a good idea, and will be useful to many passengers. But it is no substitute for pasted schedules. I want to see where it takes me, and when.

The process of posting schedules at bus stops proceeded at a very tedious pace, but we were able to tell ourselves to be patient; if we just waited long enough, we would actually see schedules at every stop. But this year that hope was blasted. It was blasted by TriMet, when it began to post pseudo-schedules with blank white paper where the real schedule ought to be. The pseudo-schedule may provide a map. I generally states what days a particular line is in service. On frequent-service lines, it states: "Buses run every 15 minutes or better during the day, every day." That's something, but notice the weasel words "during the day." What does that mean? On line 4, for example, on weekdays "the day" begins in a period between a few minutes after 05:00 and few minutes before 06:40, depending on where you are and which way you want to go; and it ends in a period between a few minutes after 21:00 and a few minutes before 23:00, again depending. On Saturdays "the day" begins a few minutes before 08:00 in Gresham, and ends there at 22:54; At the other end of the line, N. Richmond & Syracuse in St Johns, it begins at 07:07 and ends at 22:51. On Sundays, "the day" begins at 09:04 in Gresham and ends at 21:05; in St Johns it begins at 07:34 and ends at 22:41. How is the passenger supposed to know all those things? How is the passenger supposed to know what happens before and after "the day"?

And on lines other than frequent service, the information is skimpier. By the way, don't let the TriMet phone people tell you that pseudo-schedules are used only on frequent service routes; real schedules have been replaced by useless schedules on the route of line 67, a very infrequent service bus.

250 responses per page

answered question 143

skipped question 338

7. Comments:

The rep on the telephone told me that the posting of schedules was the responsibility of the sales department. When I was able to look at an organizational chart of TriMet, I could not find a sales department anywhere, so I don't know who is in charge or who came up with the present hare-brained scheme.

It now appears that we cannot hope ever to have real schedules at bus stops. Those already posted are now being replaced by pseudo-schedules.

TriMet should return to the policy of posting real schedules. If the current recession requires a temporary suspension, so be it. But what is beyond question is that TriMet should immediately cease and desist squandering precious time and money printing and posting these useless pseudo-schedules.

-
- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 11. We are being "feeded" to death. No inflation my a**. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:50 AM |
|---|----------------------------|
-
- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| 12. We need more parking at transit centers. These should be the hubs to allow people without convenient bus access and those who do not want to walk/bike in the rain to have easy access. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:10 AM |
|--|----------------------------|
-
- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| 13. More education to encourage biking? The best illuminated bicycle lights are very expensive.
And any bicycle lights are not used at all even on bikes ridden by pro/expert bike riders. A reason the Portland Metro area is one of the most dangerous places to drive is precisely because we are so bike and walker friendly the car driver must be that much more careful. Intersections can be encouraged to be used not only as a bike friendly path/intersection but a car safety friendly path. Many intersections on NW 23rd for example have obstructions/even glass bus stop passenger structures that still/actually inhibit sight lines where the next intersection over does not and is safer to use for crossing in a car. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:07 AM |
|--|----------------------------|
-
- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 14. Currently many bridges in the area are in the need of replacement and repair. This will take a great deal of money and time. Such is needed in order to avoid a major tragedy such as a bridge collapse. Tolls should be used to pay for the bridges with high volumes of traffic. This is done in the Eastern USA and in the Bay Area. The technology today allows for the automatic payment of tolls on major highways and bridges. This has the people who use the system pay for it. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:42 AM |
|---|---------------------------|
-
- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 15. Naturally there isn't a question about high ways or building any type of infrastructure that would actually HELP congestion in the city. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:28 AM |
|---|---------------------------|
-

250 responses per page

answered question 143

skipped question 338

7. Comments:

- | | | |
|-----|--|---------------------------|
| 16. | The local radio stations do a good job of relaying the info on wrecks. Tell them and let them build listeners. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:26 AM |
| 17. | Some of these questions are worded ambiguously. What does "Managing access to major streets and highways" mean? Limiting access? Expanding access? | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:25 AM |
| 18. | None. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:48 AM |
| 19. | Just try to keep the roads in good repair. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:11 AM |
| 20. | Greater emphasis should be placed on: a) incentivizing use of mass transit options; and b) disincentivizing use of automobiles when viable mass-transit alternatives exist. For example, commuters using Hwy 217 and 26 to get to Portland from Beaverton and Hillsboro have both bus and light rail options for their commutes. Adding rush-hour tolls to these roads would encourage these commuters to use the mass transit options available to them. The revenue generated from these tolls should be invested in further improving service for the commuters that use mass transit within that corridor. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 7:06 AM |
| 21. | I hate to see money wasted on highway message signs. Technology is advancing so rapidly most people will use portable handheld devices or car equipped devices to locate travel info. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:23 AM |
| 22. | This survey doesn't really give me a warm fuzzy feeling. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:20 AM |
| 23. | Wow, i am amazed at the ability to ignore the facts, where was the focus of the people that created this survey, it is totally off course. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:32 AM |
| 24. | I am concerned how tolls will impact poor and middle income residence and people with small businesses. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 6:48 PM |
| 25. | Each of these strategies needs to be implemented with a focus on equity that directs resources to vulnerable communities such as elderly and youth, and underserved communities of color and lower income. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 6:15 PM |
| 26. | We need to focus not only on keeping roads, bridges, transit, and trails in good condition, but we need to get them to a "good" condition in the first place. Roads in SW Portland are in HORRIBLE condition and prevent safe passage throughout and between the neighborhoods. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 4:56 PM |
| 27. | Price road for what they cost. \$3 toll if the road works then I am all for it, but we better price transit for what it costs. \$24 a ride on WES | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 3:32 PM |

250 responses per page

answered question 143

skipped question 338

7. Comments:

28. Along with education to youths and different employers, any type of price breaks for transit passes is a huge way to get people to ride Transit systems rather than drive a car. As a Portland State graduate student, the flexpass is not that much cheaper than the cost of parking. The cost of Parking downtown at PSU has risen much slower than the cost of the flexpass. This is a huge population of people moving into Portland that might use Transit a lot more is a better deal could be struck.

Wed, Oct 14, 2009 3:26 PM

29. #1 - keeping current ... in good condition: It is important to maintain our investments, but maintaining and keeping in good conditions does NOT mean adding more lanes.
#4 - Educating ... compared to most other items on this list, this is a very low cost way to increase use of transit and biking.
#6 - Providing more travel info: providing travel info is important, but I think what is currently available is more than adequate.

Wed, Oct 14, 2009 1:59 PM

30. Don't forget about making it safe and convenient to take alternative transit (bus, bike, walk)

Wed, Oct 14, 2009 1:43 PM

31. Emphasis needs to be on expanding transit services. Make cost of driving more accurately reflect the true cost of driving. Educate yourselves and the public about the true cost of driving.

Wed, Oct 14, 2009 12:16 PM

32. The worst times travelling in the region are when an artery is blocked but you are in a car between exits. Forewarning with signs and detours as early as possible are critical for improving the use of all transportation.

Wed, Oct 14, 2009 10:43 AM

33. If mass transit were safer, faster, and much more convenient, people would actually use it. Right now, it is way too inconvenient except for commuting and attending an occasional game or concert. Evening/after school hours are scary with gangs on board, as well as druggies and ex-cons talking about their exploits in a manner intended to be intimidating.

Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:37 AM

34. These are all good ideas but you probably are underestimating the costs involved in accomplishing these things build more into the budget for this. And for operating costs so we don't repeat giving high school kids bus passes then cutting back service on lines they use to get to the school.

Wed, Oct 14, 2009 7:24 AM

35. providing some form of monitoring system for avenues such as sw 91st avenue where it is a free for all.

Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:00 PM

36. People need to pay for the true cost of their transportation choices. We all know the automobile is the most expensive transportation choice for society,

Tue, Oct 13, 2009 6:47 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 143

skipped question 338

7. Comments:

the community and the world. Spending money on anything that makes driving, especially a single occupancy vehicle, easy and pleasurable should be prohibited. Spending money on green ways of traveling (bike/walk) and on public transportation should be increased so that riding the bus or train is PLEASURABLE. Let's switch the costs and spend what we do on the other modes with what you all want to spend for the automobile.

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------------------------|
| 37. | Follow London's lead on taxing driving in urban centers. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 4:22 PM |
| 38. | Take care of the current system and make modifications to eliminate bottlenecks and improve flow. Use technology to aid in this effort. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 3:34 PM |
| 39. | Emphasis and attention that focuses on the automobile needs to be reduced and refocuses on more environmentally friendly alternative. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 3:31 PM |
| 40. | TriMet should charge for parking at all its park-and-ride lots and use the revenue for improved feeder bus service.
Buses should have signal priority, especially on heavily used lines and at critical intersections such as those with heavy congestion or those with heavy bus activity such as near transit centers. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 2:48 PM |
| 41. | What the heck does "Managing access to major streets and highways" even mean? Survey is flawed, there isn't a Unsure/ No Opinion, option. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 12:39 PM |
| 42. | Most trips are in cars...help cars and commerce move more freely on our roads rather than constantly trying to reduce the number of vehicular trips. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 12:16 PM |
| 43. | maximize what you have through smart automation and information to allow folks to make smarter choices when in route or preparing route. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:31 AM |
| 44. | Generally I find "soft" strategies such as passes, programs, PR, advertising etc to be ineffective. Programs that concentrate on safety and on better asset management are, however, very important. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:08 AM |
| 45. | When it comes to roads - fix it first! (as opposed to widen it, build more, etc.) | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 10:52 AM |
| 46. | Toll roads and increase parking fees should not be considered. The current roads and bridges should be improved to support increased traffic issues. Congestion needs to be reduced not created! | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 10:28 AM |
| 47. | parking fees are high enough | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 7:13 AM |
| 48. | Use prices (tolls and parking) to manage demand. We should stop increasing capacity, and use our existing capacity to its full potential, but shifting SOV trips to transit, carpools and bikes. There's no better way to accomplish these goals | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 6:04 AM |

250 responses per page

answered question 143

skipped question 338

7. Comments:

than by pricing road access and parking space.

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 49. busses would be cheaper and would better serve many communities | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:18 PM |
| 50. All of this does not take into account the lack of affordable housing in areas of high demand. If more \$ were invested in supporting affordable housing development in areas of high demand, there would be less need for some of these strategies. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 5:49 PM |
| 51. I think those that do not add to the carbon footprint as well as health problems associated with car pollution should be rewarded. Car pools, mass transit discounts, discounts on health insurance, should be utilized and expanded. Things that let car drivers know about the real cost of cars, toll booths, higher parking fees, limited parking spaces, etc. would be good. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:30 PM |
| 52. Put more people into car-free modes of transportation, and less money will need to be spent on maintaining the existing street/highway/bridge infrastructure. Prevention is less costly than treatment, right? | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:10 PM |
| 53. Users whose vehicles have the greatest physical impact on wear and tear of roads should be asked to pay a larger share of their maintenance costs. Stop subsidizing automotive travel so lopsidedly! Making it more expensive to drive a car will drive up demand for [more affordable] public transit and change public opinion in favor of supporting transit more. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:55 PM |
| 54. Tolls are a necessary tool for managing congestion, but they must only be implemented in conjunction with a tiered pricing system or similar tool to ensure that their burden does not fall disproportionately on those who can least afford them. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:45 PM |
| 55. Bike Infrastructure! We need bike priority streets, bike boulevards, bike lanes, and walking systems to make for healthy communities. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:24 PM |
| 56. Tolls are regressive and elitist. Education and incentives should be preferred. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:14 PM |
| 57. Again, a nearly TOTAL re-ordering is in the future and needs to begin now. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:11 PM |
| 58. The existing traffic message signs are sufficient. Please do not consider toll booths, that will only add to congestion. I love the yellow flashing left turn light, please continue to add it at intersections. I'd like for carpooling inscentives to be passed to the people who actually carpool. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 12:02 PM |
| 59. DO not tax or implement higher fees for people parking to take mass transit. I already hear people complain about the cost of WES. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 11:37 AM |

250 responses per page

answered question 143

skipped question 338

7. Comments:

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------------------------|
| 60. | I support increasing prices for parking and increasing areas where payment for parking is required. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:16 AM |
| 61. | Try for incentives (a handful of well advertised, high impact) to modify behaviour rather than lots of new fees that just build up a sense of being nickled & dimed for everything and punished into the bargain. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:11 AM |
| 62. | When are you going to start paying me to ride my bike to work? | Sun, Oct 11, 2009 1:22 AM |
| 63. | Transportation should support businesses in downtowns, main streets and shopping centers | Sat, Oct 10, 2009 9:11 AM |
| 64. | Just putting in timing in Washington County along major streets would save a lot of time and fuel. Reduce frustration. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 6:07 PM |
| 65. | We need to pay for roads and bridges, and a toll would be a fair way to do it. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 2:34 PM |
| 66. | Focus more on congestion management in dense urban areas. People who chose to live in sprawl should have to live with the reality of their choices rather than have the roadway cleared for them at the beginning of their trip. I think that congestion is falsely associated with density. It's the required auto movement from the sprawl areas into the urban areas that is the root of the congestion. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:57 PM |
| 67. | Although tolling is a sound economic strategy for changing travel behavior, consideration should be given to the fact that many commuters do not have the flexibility to alter travel times to avoid cost impacts. In addition, there is a need for alternate routes of travel and frequent transit service to desired destinations. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:13 PM |
| 68. | When considering parking availability and fees you need to consider the impact on retail and employment. Too often we think people have access to transit etc when they may not. For example inadequate park and rides to access transit. Malls and internet shopping still have free parking. The more we discourage people from driving to downtown or city centers the more this commerce will atrophy.

However, the above in general appears to have good bang for the buck. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:00 PM |
| 69. | yikes! | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:38 AM |
| 70. | This is clearly biased toward mass transit. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:36 AM |

250 responses per page

answered question 143

skipped question 338

7. Comments:

71. Need to address how new communities are planned- and the density, capacity, supporting investment of existing neighborhoods that are being targeted for increased density. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:24 AM
-
72. When making changes/updates, please make a point of educating the public of their options. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:59 AM
-
73. Dump the gas tax. Charge drivers per mile. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:37 AM
-
74. Efficiency upgrades, such as fixing a failing intersection, should focus on getting vehicles through congestion points without increasing the footprint of our road system. Increased footprint equals more runoff and a steeper climb to fixing our failing streams. Fixing failed intersections should not sacrifice open space, quality of life, or water quality. Thu, Oct 8, 2009 6:28 PM
-
75. Alternate transportation share will not go up until we make driving less convenient. Thu, Oct 8, 2009 8:45 AM
-
76. A lot of the techno items are diversions from doing something real-that would reduce demand for driving Thu, Oct 8, 2009 8:38 AM
-
77. If there is one thing that any organization can improve at it is communication. Signs for cars, bikes and pedestrians alike should be prudent in their placement and their information. I can list several issues with the interstate freeway system in the Metro area that require improvement in signage. Please make sign review and improvement a priority. Wed, Oct 7, 2009 12:55 PM
-
78. So-called "congestion pricing" discriminates against working people with fixed schedules who cannot help but drive to and from their jobs at times set by their employers. A fundamental principle of an open society is that everyone in that society should have equal access on the same terms to publicly financed infrastructure - be it libraries, schools or parks. Making people pay more for the time of day when they have to use a highway or bridge violates this principle. It also falsely assumes that people have a lot of discretion over when they travel. Only some people will be able to redirect their trips to off-peak hours. People who can (like the retired) already avoid roads during peak hours. The reason highways are congested in the morning and late afternoon is that is when people have to get to and from work and appointments that can only be scheduled during the day. This penalizes working people. It may also discourage people from making appointments with service providers at the times of day when "congestion pricing" is in effect. So doctors, dentists and others may find it hard to schedule patients for those hours of the day when congestion pricing adds to the cost of someone coming in for care. This is a

250 responses per page

answered question 143

skipped question 338

7. Comments:

bad idea.

79. Increase incentives for commuters to use transit, including better / secure bike parking at transit centers, improved & safe connections for pedestrians to bus routes & stops, and support for Trimet to reinstate many of cancelled routes & recent service reductions. Tue, Oct 6, 2009 11:20 AM

80. The nicer you make the Metro area, the more people will move here to enjoy our "high quality of life".
As long as we are a people magnet, my family is going to go broke paying taxes to improve our infrastructure for new arrivals. Try offering free vasectomies to Metro residents. Seriously, the appetite for investment is not sustainable in the long run and there are less and less "living wages" to support it all. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 9:15 PM

81. Create incentives for people to use public transportation, carpool, walk or bike. Look to existing cities around the world that are already doing this successfully, and create a model based on their systems. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 3:50 PM

82. "Increasing parking fees, shared parking for multiple uses and price discounts for carpools or short-term parking in centers, downtowns, main streets and areas served by high quality transit." is away to discourage people from driving. The problem here is that many government agencies are located in dense areas where driving space and parking are at a premium and people must still go there to transact business which is required, often by law. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 3:08 PM

Consequently these policies simply further penalize those who cannot afford to live or work near these locations.

83. The priority should be to maintain and improve operation of the existing system as long as possible. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 8:27 AM

84. Parking fees are outrageous now. Fees on Sundays? Whose bright idea was that? Mon, Oct 5, 2009 7:19 AM

85. Tolls would tax the people who actually use the roads so they make sense. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 5:50 AM

86. Since most residents in the area use auto transportation, that is where the focus should be. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 5:06 AM

87. Given the low cost for these items and the potential impact, they should be implemented as soon as practical. Sun, Oct 4, 2009 6:58 PM

250 responses per page

answered question **143**

skipped question **338**

7. Comments:

88. this would be great: Increasing smart technology like signal priority at intersections - all lights should only operate when there are cars at the intersection!!!! Sun, Oct 4, 2009 4:11 PM
-
89. More traffic patrols are needed. The City could finance through traffic fines, on the B-H highway alone! Sun, Oct 4, 2009 2:32 PM
-
90. There has to be a careful balance between increasing the cost to those that drive their own cars and providing viable transit alternatives. If there isn't a transit alternative and the pricing on cars, either through parking, tolls, etc., becomes onerous, it could damage the economic growth of the areas where access becomes expensive. Sun, Oct 4, 2009 12:47 PM
-
91. None of this is supported by the people who will have to pay for it and use it. Sat, Oct 3, 2009 4:24 PM
-
92. More carrots than sticks, but tolls, time-of-use charges, etc. for managing congestion. Safer bikeways, esp. SW Portland; many non-bikers won't ride due to lack of safe routes; flatter routes will be most popular/important if well protected. SW Barbur comes to mind. Sat, Oct 3, 2009 6:57 AM
-
93. Why don't you wake up make the cyclists share the burden? They should be licensed, have plates on their vehicles, carry insurance, etc. And, while you're at it, pass laws that force cyclists to abide by the rules of the road, e.g. stop at stop signs, not swerve around cars, etc. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:02 PM

If you keep upping parking costs, the downtown area of Portland, already been gutted by Mayor Katz, will become a full-fledged war zone because normal citizens will not be frequenting it. Why is it, this city council and the state do everything possible to kill small business? :You folks need to understand that you are in your job is to work for the people, not against them. And, incidentally, you work for all of us, not just the folks in the Pearl and other trendy spots that you have promoted. The property tax payer is not providing a big cookie jar for you all to dip into when you choose to fluff something up.

94. Make safe and continuous bike lanes and paths a priority. Use technology and urban planning to strongly advocate for arterials to have safe and continuous bike lanes and paths. Use overpasses to accommodate bikes and pedestrian safety and in general use urban planners and scientist to advise on how best to accommodate the future. The problem that I see is that it is very difficult to get the public to support this when Metro is supporting paths that go through neighborhoods where they are not wanted or even on privately owned property. Metro needs to back off of paths that the neighborhoods don't want Fri, Oct 2, 2009 2:44 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 143

skipped question 338

7. Comments:

and to make it very clear that bike paths will be put where bike riders need them and where neighborhood quality of life is not degraded by the paths so the public regains confidence that "the right thing will be done" and will support the projects including the expenditures. In no cases should massive expenditures be allocated to support questionable approaches where more acceptable and less expensive alternatives are available. For example it is very expensive to rebuild the Terwilliger/Highway 43 intersection and have a bike path go under. Building a bike pedestrian bridge from the end of First St. in Lake Oswego to the Terwilliger path is much less expensive and provides a safe route. True there are many other issues with this and other alternative solutions to extremely expensive projects but it would not hurt to convene a "design charette" of scientists and urban planners and see if they can come up with something that would save tens of millions of dollars and provide a completely acceptable alternative.

-
95. I think a toll on the new I-5 bridge is likely a necessity. Also, there should be "long term" lots to encourage use of the Red Line to PDX. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 2:36 PM
-
96. recommend more bus routes to high capacity transit areas; recommend better road directional signs on highways and high use routes; very strongly recommend that downtown traffic signals allow for vehicles to make right turns upon green signal change PRIOR to allowing pedestrians to cross through walk. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:30 AM
-
97. Managing access--if you are thinking very few entrance/exit points on our current road system--it hurts traffic flow more than it helps probably should open up as many cul de sacs as you can to try and smooth out some congestion points---unless you are talking about a limited access "Toll" type through fare which I think holds a lot of merit. I do not think you should encourage walking/biking persay in transportation planning-- It is basically dangerous to co mingle. Market conditions will/would take care of that. I do believe there should be more of a benefit for carpoolers and less benefit (work days) for single drivers. Employer incentives from the prevailing control agencies to help encourage their employees to bus, transit, car pool would be very beneficial--could be done now and there would not be the back lash that a "govt" edict would encourage. Increasing parking fees not the best idea--Maybe all on street parking (during work week /change parking times) would be for two or more people to a car --The singles would have to park in a garage at a higher price. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:23 AM
-
98. Variable pricing for parking is the most effective strategy for shifting non-essential travel to other modes or other times of day. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 10:14 AM
-

250 responses per page

answered question 143

skipped question 338

7. Comments:

99. The last thing I want to see is money taxed on cars and spent on high capacity transit. How far would billions go for roads and bridges that people use v. new max line which people don't and the only way to make them is tax and restrict freedoms have now. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:58 AM
-
100. Downtown Portland or Beaverton is not the center of my universe. Urban communities need to develop more jobs to support the people who live in their communties. This would created less commuting. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:20 AM
-
101. Gasoline tax increase, gasoline tax increase, gasoline tax increase!!!!!!! By dollars per gallon! Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:08 AM
-
102. Smart technology should include aligning signals so traffic can keep moving, not having the signal two blocks ahead cycling inti yellow just as the first signal is turning green. I see this ALL THE TIME, and nobody gets anywhere. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:02 AM
-
103. Oh, that's what TSMO stands for! (Still don't actually get it. Maybe i was right the first time) Fri, Oct 2, 2009 8:15 AM
-
104. You still do not address the real needs of the commuter. He needs to get to a place of employment that will provide him will a salary that will allow him to pay for the transportation improvements. The remarks that our mass transit strategies are efficient are totally false. They don't take into account the federal funds which we pay, nor the local bonds, nor the tax abatements on buildings near the lines, nor the free and discounted rider tickets that tax payers have to pay. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:54 AM
-
105. I don't like the idea of increasing parking fees on main streets, as I believe this would hurt small business. I do support shared parking for multiple uses and price discounts for carpools in downtowns. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:44 AM
-
106. We need a bridge across to Vancouver, better transportation solutions on the west side of town, I-5, Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:44 AM
-
107. I believe public transportation is important, but I believe to much investment is being put into public transportation, instead put the money into public roadways. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:26 AM
-
108. Tolls would be excellent if there were a way to address their regressive nature -- the disproportionate cost to the poor.
If we can have learned to recycle in only a few years, perhaps through massive public education, we can learn to drive less, more considerately, and efficiently.
ALSO, put people who text while driving IN JAIL. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:13 AM

250 responses per page

answered question 143

skipped question 338

7. Comments:

- | | | |
|------|---|--------------------------|
| 109. | Public transit is great, sexy, very convenient for individuals. But what about reducing trucks on the road? What thought has gone into that? | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 6:47 AM |
| 110. | Whatever we can do to make it easier for people to get out of their cars should be given high priority. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 8:52 PM |
| 111. | We need to make better use of the system we have now. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 8:19 PM |
| 112. | If we can not pay to maintain what we've got, then we should not be adding more Roads and Bridges to the system. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:54 PM |
| 113. | Incentives for biking and public transportation. Disincentives for driving. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:22 PM |
| 114. | Why do we always focus on building larger infrastructure, when it is clearly unsustainable and comes at the expense of improving/maintaining the current system. Bigger isn't always better. Let's focus on smarter, NOT bigger transportation infrastructure & technologies. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:35 PM |
| 115. | User fees should be increased greatly. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:21 PM |
| 116. | Amazing how much money we spend without actually increasing capacity! We need more lanes if we keep putting more people on the same roads | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 5:58 PM |
| 117. | Did I mention bike boulevards? Also, I love the new countdown signs that go with crosswalks! | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:57 PM |
| 118. | 'very important' to keep infrastructure in good repair, but tendency is to go overboard and neglect the imaginative, less costly, and green | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:54 PM |
| 119. | Tolls would be ok only if it were electronically checked and by not having any slowing at the checkpoint. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:20 PM |
| 120. | Bring back the electric bus | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:15 PM |
| 121. | would love to see tolls during transportation heavy hours, especially for long distance commuters!! | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:14 PM |
| 122. | Tolls create more reliance on local roads rather than high occupancy options. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:02 PM |
| 123. | We need disincentives for auto travel in combination with incentives for transit and bicycle. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:45 PM |
| 124. | None. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:12 PM |

250 responses per page

answered question 143

skipped question 338

7. Comments:

125. I avoid downtown Portland at all costs. I see no reason to support its existence. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:05 PM
Turn the office buildings into housing units for those of you who wish to live like ants.
-
126. It always the same solution isn't it? Raise taxes & add tolls. How about Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:03 PM
increasing efficiency and getting more bang for your buck on a project. Smart technology is a good use of tax dollars.
I advocate maintaing current infrastructure. I cycle, but I don't see improving trails as a high priority unless cyclists pay for it. Some of the bike paths in Beaverton are ridiculous and make the commute more dangerous.
-
127. Parking fees are too low. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:00 PM
-
128. In general these all sound good and my tendency is to rate them as all very Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:57 PM
important. However that doesn't seem realistic. This doesn't seem like a very useful way of providing guidance.
-
129. Still don't understand why Oregon can't get a gas tax increase to fund more Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:46 PM
highway improvements.
We saw gas go over \$4.00 gallon and the world didn't end. Having a 6 to 10 cent per gallon increase should be OK and would go a long way to funding infrastructure improvments like new lanes and intersection improvements
-
130. Timing of signals along heavily traveled routes is a must! Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:41 PM
-
131. I don't think tolls are the right tool for metering although they may work for Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:29 PM
funding. People travel for the most part because they can't get what they need closer to the origin of a given trip. I would like to see more effort put into land-use planning and zoning instead of relying on tolls to influence behavior. A big problem with tolls is that we will eventually rely on as the metering device and development continues to occur in ways that increase the demand for transportation.
-
132. Increase all parking fees everywhere - charge the true cost of providing parking Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:24 PM
-
133. Reduce the use of personal automobiles by whatever means possible: Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:22 PM
encouragement; education; tolls; parking fees; easy and safe bike use; gasoline tax; mass transit that is: high quality, comfortable, free, fast and convenient.
-
134. do not impose road tolls Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:20 PM
-
135. Study what other successful cities are doing regarding cost controls -- and let Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:19 PM
the public know what has been studied, as well as letting us know why it would

250 responses per page

answered question 143

skipped question 338

7. Comments:

or would not work in the Portland Metro area.

136. Having spoken with some Fed. officials in DC it appears we have no real input as you already know what you plan to do. This is just a farce. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:16 PM

137. I love the crosswalk timers at intersections. Tolls on the "new" Sellwood bridge, that increase with the distance you have travelled to cross it. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:12 PM

138. Carbon tax - what are you waiting for? Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:08 PM

139. An increase in the gas tax is the most equitable and inteligent way to fund these needs. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:05 PM

140. tolls and other pricing strategies need to be implemented two years before a final decision is made on the Columbia River Crossing Mon, Sep 28, 2009 3:37 PM

141. Improvements that benefit residents of neighboring areas (Clackamas, for example) that have been unwilling to contribute to their development (e.g., the Sellwood bridge) should have to pay tolls. Mon, Sep 28, 2009 2:46 PM

142. Pricing is paramount!
While public acceptance is currently a barrier, a Digital TV transition-like program could work. Give each household a \$100 credit when the new system-wide pricing plan goes into place. The price for free-flowing traffic will seem worth it if drivers get a chance to try it for free in the beginning and they are offered other options for getting around. Wed, Sep 23, 2009 8:20 AM

143. Divert all funds and attention to freeway, highway and roads improvement. Wed, Sep 16, 2009 6:43 PM

250 responses per page

answered question **143**

skipped question **338**

8. If there were to be more investment on transportation systems management and operation, what other types of investment should be decreased to accommodate this optimization?

**Response
Count**

 [Hide replies](#) **148**

answered question **148**

skipped question **333**

8. If there were to be more investment on transportation systems management and operation, what other types of investment should be decreased to accommodate this optimization?

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 1. Expanding UGB | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:44 PM |
| 2. I feel, that especially when needed, administrative personnel, ie. management, can also conduct "route" work. Transit information, drivers, security, maintenance & repairs, upkeep, etc. Whatever is needed and the budget is short to cover an additional employee. This will also help keep management and administration "in touch" with their customers, employees, and business community. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:36 PM |
| 3. Reduce bike lanes | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:47 PM |
| 4. fewer new roads or big highway projects | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:46 PM |
| 5. . . . too much \$\$ is wasted on Admin which are overpaid and do absolutely nothing. The public is not as ignorant as you may think. One quarter of Admin employees are useless. We shouldn't be wasting transit \$\$'s when the middle class folks are struggling. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:45 PM |
| 6. New highways & roads. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:28 PM |
| 7. Big freeways | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:30 PM |
| 8. Well, for starters do as I proposed above and stop wasting money on pseudo-schedules. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 12:38 PM |
| 9. Freeway investment and road widening. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 11:48 AM |
| 10. I thin the investment in management and operation is about right | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 11:38 AM |
| 11. How about better fiscal management? How many people need to stand around and watch someone roll out pavement? | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:50 AM |
| 12. Again you ask an either or question. Increase your budget/spending/talent at fixing things that cost increase maintenance fees for passenger cars and trucks. Not just potholes but low partially submerged manhole covers cause similar damage to ball joints/wheel alignment/tire balancing as typical potholes. \$\$\$ could be used instead of maintenance toward fees/toll roads/raised parking fees. Where is your study on your web site on the damage/dmages done by potholes? Did Salem fix/reduce potholes at a far lesser coast than Portland? What city has the most efficient plan for pothole reduction? Oregon lets drivers use studded tires without a fee? How many have been cited for leaving them on too long? Where is the studded tire impact study on your web | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:07 AM |

250 responses per page

answered question 148

skipped question 333

8. If there were to be more investment on transportation systems management and operation, what other types of investment should be decreased to accommodate this optimization?

site?

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------------------------|
| 13. | Mass transit investments should be decreased until we know what our future needs will be. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:25 AM |
| 14. | Expansion of light rail should be curtailed. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:54 AM |
| 15. | I believe this could be a "self-funding" proposition. If transportation systems management and operation are better optimized, there would be less expenses, saving investment dollars. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:48 AM |
| 16. | Lessen city involvement with pioneer courthouse square activities, stop painting large areas with bright green paint for cyclists near Nordstroms area on SW Broadway and other areas. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:29 AM |
| 17. | This is not just about traffic and vehicles it is about the PROPER overall planning of the cities. The proper zoning and placement of business/manufacturing sites in relation to highways and homes. Again, PROPER and Intellegent planning of the cities. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 7:08 AM |
| 18. | Stop adding trees, shrubs, mulch and sprinkler systems to the sides of roads. Too much maintenance cost and plants are usually torn out at some point. See trees on Wilsonville rd near Wood Middle school, most will be torn out with Oak Park project...more waste. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:23 AM |
| 19. | I'm not in government, but that's where I'd look first. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:20 AM |
| 20. | everything listed above. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:32 AM |
| 21. | Keep as is. Need all pieces of the puzzle | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:11 PM |
| 22. | highway projects | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 6:15 PM |
| 23. | Transit | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 3:32 PM |
| 24. | Traditional road expansion. If traffic and congestion can be lessened by more efficient systems, then road expansions would not be as necessary. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 3:26 PM |
| 25. | Not sure. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 12:53 PM |
| 26. | Highway expansion projects. For example, the CRC bridge project. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 11:43 AM |
| 27. | An increase in the quantity of highways. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 10:43 AM |
| 28. | Police on every MAX train. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:37 AM |

250 responses per page

answered question 148

skipped question 333

8. If there were to be more investment on transportation systems management and operation, what other types of investment should be decreased to accommodate this optimization?

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------------------------|
| 29. | Long term we do need high capacity transit but we need to plan and build infrastructure to support the density along with market acceptance before we invest in it. So take money from that category to support these efforts. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 7:24 AM |
| 30. | I believe if we just insured that all vehicles has proper identification we as a state would have a nice size budget to work with. Let's start there. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:00 PM |
| 31. | Simply decrease substantially all planned investments that will accommodate the automobile. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 6:47 PM |
| 32. | Just do plain, simple signage improvements...put the right signs in the right places; don't just put up more signs...take down old signs that don't make sense anymore. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 4:26 PM |
| 33. | Priority should be for those investments that prepare for the post-automobile age. We should rely on energy economics to solve the automobile congestion problem. We need to build the infrastructure to survive the decline of the automobile. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 4:22 PM |
| 34. | Bike and light rail. Use Bus Rapid Transit for future high capacity as a complement and lower cost alternative to LRT. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 3:34 PM |
| 35. | Reduce street mileages in favor of more car sharing options and more people per vehicle. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 3:31 PM |
| 36. | we don't need to decrease funding if we tax transportation system users appropriately. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 3:29 PM |
| 37. | Reduce smart technology at this time. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 2:54 PM |
| 38. | Stop wasting money on the CRC. The money already spent on staff and consultants could have extended MAX to Hayden Island along with a local bridge for cars, bikes and pedestrians that would have reduced interchange traffic turbulence on I-5. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 2:48 PM |
| 39. | New road construction | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 2:02 PM |
| 40. | Spend more on streets for cars and less on rail lines and bike lanes. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 12:16 PM |
| 41. | decrease long term big scale programs that do not clearly show value to citizens and business affected. do not CLEARLY SHOW VALUE. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:31 AM |
| 42. | General capacity increases should take a back seat to better utilization of existing capacity. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:08 AM |

250 responses per page

answered question 148

skipped question 333

8. If there were to be more investment on transportation systems management and operation, what other types of investment should be decreased to accommodate this optimization?

43.	Transit, bike and sidewalks could be decreased. These do not move commerce!	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 10:28 AM
44.	Less for funding for new roads and bridges for automobiles.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:38 AM
45.	Transit.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:19 AM
46.	shop for the best deals and make sure all bids are competitive you get the most efficient use of the funds.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:06 AM
47.	Highways and the CRC.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 6:04 AM
48.	New Highways should not be built	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:09 PM
49.	Road expansion projects and the Columbia River Crossing	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:43 PM
50.	high speed transit	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:18 PM
51.	Don't build the CRC	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 6:34 PM
52.	See above. Invest in the development of affordable housing along transit corridors and town centers. Ensuring affordable housing is part of the mix in an area of high demand should be part of the transportation plan.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 5:49 PM
53.	Investment on getting trucks off the road and putting loads onto trains.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:30 PM
54.	Highway widening	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:21 PM
55.	Reduce road surface maintenance investments, and eliminate the creation of new roads. Improve on what is currently in place, rather than expanding access.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:10 PM
56.	Funding for highway expansion should be decreased.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:45 PM
57.	Decrease highway maintenance or defer costs for highway driving in a more equitable manner. It doesn't take much money to substantially increase the bike network.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:24 PM
58.	Hmm, I see a trend ... freeway expansion and CRC! Eliminate the CRC alone, and we'd have enough to fund practically everything else. Okay, so my math may be a little fuzzy.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:14 PM
59.	New road construction.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:11 PM
60.	elimiate light rail outside of the core city	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:37 AM

250 responses per page

answered question 148

skipped question 333

8. If there were to be more investment on transportation systems management and operation, what other types of investment should be decreased to accommodate this optimization?

61. Widening roads and intersections especially under the guise of safety projects.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:16 AM
62. More live/work communities to reduce the load on and environmental impact of roadways and mass transit	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 9:11 AM
63. Rail oriented transit	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:42 AM
64. High-capacity transit.	Sun, Oct 11, 2009 7:14 AM
65. No more spending on rail transit.	Sun, Oct 11, 2009 1:22 AM
66. Uncertain	Sat, Oct 10, 2009 1:00 PM
67. Reduce light rail investment	Sat, Oct 10, 2009 9:11 AM
68. Do not go hog wild on i% bridge. Tax trucks for damage to existing bridges. Toll charges on driving. We should all pay the reasonable price it takes to support driving.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 6:07 PM
69. less investment in highways	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 2:34 PM
70. Less investment in facilities in exurban areas.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:57 PM
71. spend less on mgmt of transprotation systems	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:53 PM
72. Transit	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 12:24 PM
73. Have a little faith in developing technologies	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:40 AM
74. political overhead and paperwork	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:38 AM
75. Metro and ODOT administration.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:36 AM
76. Building new roads	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:24 AM
77. I would need to do more research in order to answer this question.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:59 AM
78. Slow the development of new mass transit. There have been crime problems and economic failures along transit lines, and block size as well as line capacity limits light rail capacity. Other means of ground transportation has more flexibility.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:44 AM
79. Highway improvements within the urbanized area.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:37 AM
80. Maybe the solution is not to decrease other types of investment, but to raise funds using some of the strategies, like tolling and parking fees, above.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:32 AM

250 responses per page

answered question 148

skipped question 333

8. If there were to be more investment on transportation systems management and operation, what other types of investment should be decreased to accommodate this optimization?

- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 81. By implementing better design we can save money on needless or redundant traffic control facilities and signage. | Thu, Oct 8, 2009 9:41 PM |
| 82. New road building. Again, kill the Sunnybrook extension and similarly short-sighted, ill-conceived construction plans that are superficially about easing congestion. | Thu, Oct 8, 2009 6:28 PM |
| 83. Roads and highways, especially new ones. | Thu, Oct 8, 2009 8:45 AM |
| 84. Columbia River Crossing super highway is a negative investment - it will increase sprawl, pollution and traffic. | Thu, Oct 8, 2009 8:38 AM |
| 85. Well of course it would be high capacity transit...because if our transportation system were more efficient there would be less need for transit. | Wed, Oct 7, 2009 12:55 PM |
| 86. Stop widening highways | Tue, Oct 6, 2009 6:08 PM |
| 87. Decrease spending on new roads. WES just opened, unless there is a significant need to enhance that service then it shouldn't be a priority now. | Tue, Oct 6, 2009 3:38 PM |
| 88. A smaller CRC bridge that includes light rail, bike & ped facilities. | Tue, Oct 6, 2009 11:20 AM |
| 89. This is such a leading question that assumes we want more investment. I say invest less. | Mon, Oct 5, 2009 9:15 PM |
| 90. Highways, bridges. | Mon, Oct 5, 2009 12:49 PM |
| 91. Maintenance costs need to be reduced through more intelligent re-surfacing and BANNING CHAINS AND STUDS. | Mon, Oct 5, 2009 9:18 AM |
| 92. HCT | Mon, Oct 5, 2009 8:27 AM |
| 93. You need to invest routes out to rural western washington county. Banks residents pay the taxes but don't get the services. | Mon, Oct 5, 2009 7:19 AM |
| 94. Having mass transit available 24/7. | Mon, Oct 5, 2009 5:50 AM |
| 95. More auto lanes, less bicycle lanes. | Mon, Oct 5, 2009 5:06 AM |
| 96. Large highway projects seem impractical at this point when you take into consideration the effects of global climate change and peak oil. I'd decrease investment in this area. | Sun, Oct 4, 2009 6:58 PM |
| 97. Let the free market determine what investments will be made. We do not want this METRO's socialist redistribution of wealth. | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 4:24 PM |

250 responses per page

answered question 148

skipped question 333

8. If there were to be more investment on transportation systems management and operation, what other types of investment should be decreased to accommodate this optimization?

- | | | |
|------|---|---------------------------|
| 98. | road widening, road expansion | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 1:52 PM |
| 99. | High capacity transit | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 11:10 AM |
| 100. | Investments in larger car capacity... when carbon pricing and/or market forces put gas prices above \$4 again, we will have excess capacity. Not interested in building excess road capacity. | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 6:57 AM |
| 101. | Why not get rid of the PDC? They are corrupt and the money could be used in better ways. Also, why are so many exempt from paying property taxes? How many millions of dollars are forked over to the developers, etc. in the form of property tax abatements that could be used for the infrastructure of Portland, including transportation, sewers, etc. It is really quite despicable. And just how sensible is it to pass Merrit Paulson all of those millions. Oh, I know that the tax payer won't have to pay a cent. Remember Mayor Katz, the financial wizard. Aren't the people still paying for that last stadium swindle? | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:02 PM |
| 102. | not sure | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:29 PM |
| 103. | Eliminate the fleet of large diesel buses in favor of less expensive smaller hybrid US-built van-buses deployed on a computer controlled interactive network with visibility of queueing at each bus stop. Increase the cost of individual trips to \$2 and provide incentive to getting monthly passes so that there would be advance visibility of ridership to allow providing adequate service. When the ridership exceeds the available service, stop the sales of the passes. Like when a theater reaches capacity. As the demand builds, add or transfer more units and vice-versa. Get a gamer to run HQ control center! | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 2:44 PM |
| 104. | Not sure. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 2:36 PM |
| 105. | Subsidies for infrastructure construction for new residential developments. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 12:56 PM |
| 106. | Reduce the investment in Regional govt. and more back to local govt. with state overview. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:23 AM |
| 107. | This feels like a loaded question -- i.e., it's encouraging respondents to say less new infrastructure. I feel we do need more infrastructure to support place-making. Presumably, TSM will save money and one would take from that it's self-financing, or saves funds from other programs. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 10:14 AM |
| 108. | non-self sustaining transportation systems | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:58 AM |

250 responses per page

answered question 148

skipped question 333

8. If there were to be more investment on transportation systems management and operation, what other types of investment should be decreased to accommodate this optimization?

- | | | |
|------|---|---------------------------|
| 109. | The average payroll for Tri Met is \$120,000. I think Tri-Met needs to review their budget much more closely. Use this saving to increase their efficiency. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:20 AM |
| 110. | New highway construction. New road construction, considering that the UGB should be left in place, allowing current infrastructure to provide the needs without need for new roads to serve new areas (other than those areas, such as Damascus, which have already been brought in. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:08 AM |
| 111. | I don't see the value in message signs along travel routes when there is really no alternative route once you are on the road. Finding out as I drive by that there is a wreck 5 miles ahead on I-205 N and the right lane is closed means what? It's too late to change plans. What are the options at this point, other than just be delayed? | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:02 AM |
| 112. | No | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 8:15 AM |
| 113. | Increases in mass transit especially street cars should be eliminated. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:54 AM |
| 114. | I don't have any suggestions, again, money is being pulled away from the road system for public transportation and I don't believe this is a great use of the dollars. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:26 AM |
| 115. | Less investment in highways. Make trucks use highways more in off-peak hours. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:13 AM |
| 116. | let congestion reign for auto travel! | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 10:04 PM |
| 117. | Road expansion or additional road building. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 8:52 PM |
| 118. | expansion of road capacity/major arterials | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 8:19 PM |
| 119. | a scaled-down I-5 bridge between PDX and Vancouver | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:32 PM |
| 120. | You need to learn how to write survey questions in plain English. Do you really think the person on the street could understand this question? | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:22 PM |
| 121. | Nothing. We shouldn't invest in anything that has to take away from something else at this time. Thank you. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:35 PM |
| 122. | No new roads should be built. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:21 PM |
| 123. | Slightly decrease some less used bus routes. Max routes seem empty at many times of the day. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:57 PM |

250 responses per page

answered question 148

skipped question 333

8. If there were to be more investment on transportation systems management and operation, what other types of investment should be decreased to accommodate this optimization?

- | | | |
|------|---|--------------------------|
| 124. | the most expensive ones, and the ones that predominantly serve the already well-served | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:54 PM |
| 125. | Sorry, again. Wish I didn't have to suggest looking for wasted dollars, but I do. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:20 PM |
| 126. | road widening, highway maintenance | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:14 PM |
| 127. | Stop widening highways. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:45 PM |
| 128. | Wrong question | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:38 PM |
| 129. | Highway widening in general. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:36 PM |
| 130. | Since we are betting optimizing what we already have, we should spend significantly less on new capacity. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:19 PM |
| 131. | Roads built to accomodate single or few occupant vehicles. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:12 PM |
| 132. | Overhead, overhead, overhead. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:05 PM |
| 133. | How about decreasing state & local goverment employees jobs, so we can use the PERS money to fix the roads. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:03 PM |
| 134. | Highway capacity increases. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:00 PM |
| 135. | Capacity expansion on highways, roads and bridges | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:53 PM |
| 136. | less on mass transit | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:46 PM |
| 137. | Light rail. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:36 PM |
| 138. | adding lanes for autos, and new roads to outlying areas | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:24 PM |
| 139. | why can't the revenues raised thru increasing zone density at urban centers be used to pay for increased transportation systems enhancements? | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:20 PM |
| 140. | I don't know. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:19 PM |
| 141. | Rail | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:16 PM |
| 142. | the Columbia rivver crossing, of course. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:12 PM |
| 143. | Enough with the deferred maintenance. You can't even take care of the roads/system that you have. How about more investment in maintenance? | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:08 PM |
| 144. | speed, having light rail above ground takes longer than driving. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:05 PM |

250 responses per page

answered question 148

skipped question 333

8. If there were to be more investment on transportation systems management and operation, what other types of investment should be decreased to accommodate this optimization?

145. The needs to be a new form of financial support for operating costs of transit. Mon, Sep 28, 2009 3:37 PM
The bus system needs to be expanded and the fares should be reduced or maintained at current levels. It would be best for auto usage to support all forms of transportation.
-
146. Other than roads/highways, as above, what are the choices? Mon, Sep 28, 2009 2:46 PM
-
147. Highway expansion, since TSMO can give us more highway bang for the buck. Wed, Sep 23, 2009 8:20 AM
-
148. Bike trails and anything bike related. No further investement in mass transit. Wed, Sep 16, 2009 6:43 PM
Don't worry about walking trails or anything else that does not focus on Freeway, Highway and Roads!

250 responses per page

answered question 148

skipped question 333

9. About two-thirds of our regional freight moves by truck, connecting producers with ports, railroads or the interstate system. Many trucks find their way onto neighborhood streets as they deliver goods to local businesses or provide home delivery. Thus, freight and the business and industrial community often benefit from a wide range of congestion-relief, roadway and bridge projects such as those identified in the RTP. In addition, many transit, pedestrian and bicycle projects help freight move more reliably by moving automobiles off highways.

Some specific freight-related policy goals that could be used to guide investment in our transportation system are listed below. How would you rate their importance to our transportation system and economy?

[>Learn more about freight and goods movement in the region](#)

	extremely important	very important	somewhat important	not very important	not at all important	Response Count
Ensure access to the region's major export facilities (Class 1 railroads, interstate highways, air cargo and marine facilities)	44.8% (151)	33.8% (114)	18.1% (61)	1.8% (6)	1.5% (5)	337
Remove major bottlenecks to benefit trucks, transit and passenger	33.7% (115)	31.1% (106)	21.1% (72)	10.3% (35)	3.8% (13)	341
					<i>answered question</i>	349
					<i>skipped question</i>	132

9. About two-thirds of our regional freight moves by truck, connecting producers with ports, railroads or the interstate system. Many trucks find their way onto neighborhood streets as they deliver goods to local businesses or provide home delivery. Thus, freight and the business and industrial community often benefit from a wide range of congestion-relief, roadway and bridge projects such as those identified in the RTP. In addition, many transit, pedestrian and bicycle projects help freight move more reliably by moving automobiles off highways.

Some specific freight-related policy goals that could be used to guide investment in our transportation system are listed below. How would you rate their importance to our transportation system and economy?

[>Learn more about freight and goods movement in the region](#)

	vehicles					
Improve major interstate or highway interchanges	23.3% (77)	23.6% (78)	32.1% (106)	15.5% (51)	5.5% (18)	330
Ensure access for delivery to retail centers, businesses and homes	11.8% (40)	28.1% (95)	44.1% (149)	11.8% (40)	4.1% (14)	338
Protect and expand industrial land uses to provide good quality jobs	26.7% (91)	25.2% (86)	27.3% (93)	14.7% (50)	6.2% (21)	341
Prevent and minimize conflicts between industrial and non-industrial or freight-related land uses	18.3% (62)	32.2% (109)	34.0% (115)	12.4% (42)	3.0% (10)	338
Develop a regional freight rail strategy and investment policy to ensure that railroads can function in the future to help take some trucks off our highways	52.5% (180)	27.7% (95)	13.1% (45)	3.5% (12)	3.2% (11)	343
Improve major street connections to current and emerging industrial areas	14.5% (49)	34.6% (117)	35.5% (120)	10.9% (37)	4.4% (15)	338
Ensure that the region's investments support a vibrant and sustainable economy to provide good jobs here	45.0% (152)	32.0% (108)	16.3% (55)	4.1% (14)	2.7% (9)	338
Ensure safe transport of hazardous loads with a regional routing strategy that avoids potential conflicts with high capacity transit while maintaining freight rail capacity	37.0% (126)	31.7% (108)	24.6% (84)	4.7% (16)	2.1% (7)	341
					answered question	349
					skipped question	132

9. About two-thirds of our regional freight moves by truck, connecting producers with ports, railroads or the interstate system. Many trucks find their way onto neighborhood streets as they deliver goods to local businesses or provide home delivery. Thus, freight and the business and industrial community often benefit from a wide range of congestion-relief, roadway and bridge projects such as those identified in the RTP. In addition, many transit, pedestrian and bicycle projects help freight move more reliably by moving automobiles off highways.

Some specific freight-related policy goals that could be used to guide investment in our transportation system are listed below. How would you rate their importance to our transportation system and economy?

[>Learn more about freight and goods movement in the region](#)

Develop a strategy for public-private funding partnerships when it benefits the public	25.3% (87)	37.8% (130)	21.8% (75)	8.1% (28)	7.0% (24)	344
<i>answered question</i>						349
<i>skipped question</i>						132

10. Comments:

Response Count

 [Hide replies](#)

119

1. Personally, I wish freight and people could be separated as much as possible. Fri, Oct 16, 2009 2:48 AM

2. Institute a time schedule for inner-city deliveries. For instance, all deliveries to downtown PDX should be finished by 7:30 am. I'm also OK with a toll for peak-hour useage of inner-city streets. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:20 PM

3. Eliminate bureaucracy and use taxpayer dollars wisely. Quit studying things to death. The State of Minnesota built the Brige that collapsed over the Missouri River in one year, for 234 million dollars, not the projected 4 Billion for the Columbia River Bridge! Something is wrong with this picture! Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:12 PM

4. Weight limit increases for trucks have destryed out hwys. This survey is slanted to direct outcomes to increase more taxes and not protect Americans from wasteful spending. Have the wealthy pay their fair share!!!! Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:45 PM

250 responses per page

answered question **119**

skipped question **362**

10. Comments:

-
5. Long-haul trucking and aviation will struggle due to fuel prices and shortages. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:28 PM
The world economy will continue to de-globalize. Investment strategies based on opposite assumptions are likely to fail. Railroads will be really important - invest there, for both passengers and freight. Get rid of the hazardous cargoes - don't give them special privileges. Don't bet on an export-based economy - bet on local businesses supplying local and regional needs.
-
6. I think that businesses should have to ensure that they have truck access if Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:17 PM
they are going to use trucks.
-
7. I BELIEVE THAT THE SOLUTIONS ARE NOT SIMPLE BUT THAT EXISTING Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:34 PM
ROADS AND INFRASTRUCTURE CAN BE IMPROVED. I BELIEVE THAT CONNECTOR PROJECTS, SPECIFICALLY 10598, 11339, 11340, 11342, SHOULD BE REMOVED FROM THE RTP. THE SOUTHERN ALIGNMENT WAS REJECTED BY 25% OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE AND 605 OF THE STAKE HOLDER WORKING GROUP. SINCE THERE WAS NO CONSENSUS THE CONNECTOR SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN INCLUDED IN ANY PROPOSAL.
-
8. Metro should require more information on whether the projects invest equitably Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:06 PM
-
9. The trouble with questionnaires of this sort is that all these goals are important Thu, Oct 15, 2009 12:38 PM
and desirable. I can't really answer meaningfully; it would depend on information I don't have.
-
10. There is a lot of information. Too much to review. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 11:48 AM
-
11. Rail transport will not work due to railroad unions. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 11:19 AM
-
12. As only one example the hardly used at all Rail Road along TV Hwy is it not Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:07 AM
used more because a typical traditional rail car is the only thing able to be thought of to use a rail road? Those rails can not be used for commuter solar rail cars with windmills on top generating electricity that can drive off and on rails? PSU has an urban studies department, how much do the Metro businesses contribute to university urban study programs? Where are all our least used rail ways? Vertical space really can be used only for buildings? Freight is the only answer for the definition of useful RR's?
-
13. The number of trucks on the roads is dangerous and makes it harder for Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:42 AM
people in passenger cars to travel in the area. Projects should be directed to reduce truck traffic for the delivery of goods.
-

250 responses per page

answered question 119

skipped question 362

10. Comments:

- | | | |
|-----|--|---------------------------|
| 14. | I don't know much about this topic, but I do know Oregon has successfully gotten trucks off the road by chasing jobs out of the state, limiting buying power, and reducing the need for freight. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:25 AM |
| 15. | None. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:48 AM |
| 16. | Again, I just don't know enough about this to make an informed decision. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:40 AM |
| 17. | We all know that there is a heavy rail bottleneck in portland. The most efficient solution is three rail terminals outside of the metro areas: one east, one south and one north of vancouver. If three rail staging terminals were created outside of the metro area, rail through the city could be reduced and be much more efficient | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:32 AM |
| 18. | Investments should promote a shift from trucks to rail whenever possible. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 7:54 PM |
| 19. | No hazardous loads in our communities | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 6:48 PM |
| 20. | Decrease spending on development of new bridges. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 3:41 PM |
| 21. | You say that many transit, pedestrian and bicycle projects help freight move more reliably by moving automobiles off highways. We still need to get employees to their job. Lets not forget how many people come from Washington to work in our industries and how many people come from rural areas. These people are not going to walk to work. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 3:32 PM |
| 22. | Items #5 and #9: there may be a question later in the survey that the following comments better relate to, but if not, then:
The practice of giving tax breaks and incentives for business to locate in the Metro area should end. If a business wants to locate or expand in the area because they like what the area has to offer, then good - let them come and provide jobs and pay their fair share of their impact on roads, schools, parks, police and fire, of societies other costs thru taxes. But we should not be giving tax incentives - that in turn causes other businesses and individuals taxes to go up even higher to make up for what they don't pay. During the recession of the 80's Oregon's unemployment was one of the highest in the nation. So the gov't came up with the idea of all kinds of tax incentives to lure businesses here to "make Oregon more recession proof" next time. Well next time is here and we still have one of the nations highest unemployment rates, along with higher taxes for roads and schools and other services. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 1:59 PM |
| 23. | We should create more freight-only corridors to eliminate freight bottlenecks and congestion. If you don't separate them out of the general traffic flow there | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 1:43 PM |

250 responses per page

answered question 119

skipped question 362

10. Comments:

will be no way to help this industry without also encouraging passenger vehicle traffic.

-
- 24.** Shifting more freight to rail will reduce roadway construction and maintenance costs, reduce energy consumption, improve environmental quality, minimize roadway congestion, improve safety. Reducing petroleum consumption will help strengthen the state and nation's economy. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 12:16 PM
-
- 25.** Use the max rails to ship light freight at night time. Incentivize regional and local freight delivery to be night time. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 10:43 AM
-
- 26.** Taxpayers shouldn't have to bear the burden for truck transport. Trucks ruin the roads and the environment. Switching back to train transport is very important. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:37 AM
-
- 27.** In denser more compact region there is no way that people cannot live closer to industrial development we have to make this a safer situation and address the livability issues but we cannot provide the seperation that was the hallmark of Euclidean zoning. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 7:24 AM
-
- 28.** again on this avenue we have many incidences of trucks such as 5 axle car carriers, gasoline tankers, or many other forms of hazardous waste traveling through this neighborhood. If an actual plan for the highway 217 issues maybe these unlawful and unsafe acts would not exist here. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:00 PM
-
- 29.** Get people out of their cars and there will be plenty of room on the road for business. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 6:47 PM
-
- 30.** length of trucks should be limited to less than 40 feet in non-industrial areas and in downtown to ensure that rail can be competitive with trucking Tue, Oct 13, 2009 3:29 PM
-
- 31.** The most effective way to expedite the movement of trucks is to provide effective alternatives to driving for commuters. Adding road capacity is counter-productive since the induced commuter traffic it will generate will preempt the capacity making it worse for the truckers.
Improving the capacity of freight rail is the most cost effective and environmentally sound way to reduce truck traffic. Replacing the swing span on the old railroad bridge with a new, wider and better located, lift span should be a project included in the RTP. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 2:48 PM
-
- 32.** How many people are informed enough to accurately participate in this part of the survey? I am NOT. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 12:39 PM
-

250 responses per page

answered question 119

skipped question 362

10. Comments:

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 33. follow Washington County's lead and put much more industrial land in the UGB. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 12:16 PM |
| 34. of course all of this is important. It's the balance that is key, and it's impossible to determine balance from these questions. Commercial near the highways, and good function roadways from your other areas of concern should support this. We should be designing our communities so that we can use much from local sources and minimize our reliance on big trucking into retail and home areas. Maximize rail use and smaller freight movement inside UGB. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:31 AM |
| 35. We must stem the trend of industrial lands being converted to non-industrial uses. A rational policy that identifies industrial areas that are vital vs. those that are marginal and could be dispensed with will be critical to our economic future. In my view, the Regionally Significant Industrial Areas program (RSIA) is not living up to this goal. We need a better policy and a better policy tool. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:08 AM |
| 36. I-5 is the main north/south freight movement from Canada to Mexico. We need to look at the Boone Bridge not just the interstate, I-205 bidge handles a large percentage of the freight traffic then all merge at the Boone Bridge. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 10:28 AM |
| 37. Long-haul freight should move primarily by rail, and investments to improve freight mobility should combine rail investments and HOT lanes (e.g. across the existing Columbia River Bridge) to move trucks and busses quickly and reliably through traffic bottlenecks. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 6:04 AM |
| 38. Decrease the proposed size of the CRC and don't worry so much about "removing the bottlenecks." The bottle necks will only move down the highway if we widen one section. We can't build our way out of it. Instead, let's think creatively about moving traffic through our region, like giving commercial freight a dedicated lane, something like a carpool lane. Provide incentives to companies for altering their workday hours, letting employees get on the roads earlier and/or later. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 9:27 PM |
| 39. We need to minimize trucking of goods. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:09 PM |
| 40. We need much better transportation planning that integrates land use policy with future transporation needs. In short, I believe that better long range planning could result in optimizing the benefits of building the transportation infrastructure and minimize its disadvantages. The current process treats transportation as an after thought, resulting in an inordinate amount of traffic being funneled into downtown areas and adjacent to established housing areas. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:26 PM |

250 responses per page

answered question **119**

skipped question **362**

10. Comments:

41. we do not need more hazardous loads thru our community - rail or highway. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:18 PM
These loads should be routed to avoid residential areas.
-
42. I'm very leery of the vaunted 'public-private funding partnerships' when it comes Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:06 PM
to important infrastructure and other government functions. Have you stayed in
one of the outsourced National Park hotels? Cheap, young helpers that don't
add value to the vacation experience. Outsourced prisons are similarly
questionable. Define true 'benefits' to the public? The cheapest route isn't
necessarily the best. Corporations will cut costs to benefit stock values, often
at the intangible expense of the public customer.
-
43. If you get some of the passenger vehicles off the road these things will not be a Mon, Oct 12, 2009 6:34 PM
major issue.
-
44. This plan lacks an analysis of how it will impact residential housing patterns. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 5:49 PM
-
45. One lane on every highway and freeway in the region should be solely Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:10 PM
dedicated to freight trucks, buses, and carpool vehicles. This will ensure
smooth access to businesses and the rapid transit of goods, while
simultaneously limiting access for cars and encouraging high-capacity transit.
-
46. Let's begin to envision a future that is less dependent on foreign Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:55 PM
manufacturing! Job creation should be truly regional and focus more on
rebuilding local and regional manufacturing so that we aren't as dependent on
long-distance transport of foreign-manufactured goods.
-
47. More details are necessary on the subject of public-private partnerships for the Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:45 PM
public to make an informed choice.
-
48. these are the strangest questions. VERY AMBIGUOUS WORDING. RAIL Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:24 PM
SERVICE SHOULD BE PRIORITIZED.
-
49. I did not answer these questions as I feel under-education about these issues Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:29 PM
and do not want to weigh in.
-
50. Air cargo is the wave of the past. Fuel consumption and carbon emissions from Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:14 PM
air travel will make this a nonviable option in the not too distant future. We
should focus on producing more in our own region, reducing the need for
freight movement. Down with private funding! That's an invitation to corruption.
-
51. Rail, reductions and re-thinking are my top 3 priorities. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:11 PM
-
52. My emphasis will continue to be on maintaining and improving existing. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 12:02 PM
Especially revitalizing old neighborhood, rentovating old business's,

250 responses per page

answered question 119

skipped question 362

10. Comments:

warehouses, etc.

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| <p>53. Area's like tualatin and Wilsonville should have devoted traffic lanes for Trucks to enter freeways. Do not dump more residential into these industrial traffic areas.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 11:37 AM</p> |
| <p>54. I think the last bullet point is an oxymoron used to work against the public and private sectors interest. Historically it has been spurious sophistry not reality.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:42 AM</p> |
| <p>55. A commercial network plan should include utilization of time-of-day movement incentives and better articulation of trucks to port facilities. In general, economic development objectives are not being adequately-served by current/past transportation investment plans or decisions.</p> | <p>Sun, Oct 11, 2009 7:14 AM</p> |
| <p>56. On paper, "public-private partnerships" are a good idea. In practice they end up being things like a stadium for the Beavers in Beaverton, or a convention center hotel. That is, a waste of money.</p> | <p>Sun, Oct 11, 2009 1:22 AM</p> |
| <p>57. One big problem with freight is the trucking industry operates w/o needed safety and vehicle inspection. In particular, I think the blatant, unmuffled therefore illegal exhaust systems are intolerable when we are discussing "balanced", "community need", etc. When I hear trucks blasting over 1 mile away there is definitely something wrong going on. It taints my support for this industry as I perceive the industry as not policing itself and largely ignoring the problem.</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 6:07 PM</p> |
| <p>58. Consider more investment in freight distribution nodes in urban areas, to reduce the use of city surface streets by large vehicles and improve coordination of deliveries - "freight-pooling". Incentivize the use of smaller, energy efficient fleet vehicles in urban areas.</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:57 PM</p> |
| <p>59. Now you are making sense. I would add that an emphasis on air, marine and pipeline even for regional movement as ways to reduce truck presence. You also need to think about over size load routes as you densify your area.</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:00 PM</p> |
| <p>60. Continually expanding infrastructure for freight on roads and highways is not the answer to creating a healthy, sustainable community.</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 12:23 PM</p> |
| <p>61. running out of time</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:38 AM</p> |
| <p>62. Focus on marketing of local goods and services- reducing the need for interstate transportation of goods</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:24 AM</p> |

250 responses per page

answered question 119

skipped question 362

10. Comments:

- 63.** It is critical that freight traffic be protected whether that is roadway, rail, or water. Didn't Clinton say "It's the economy stupid". Guess what it still is. You don't want to be the planners in Buffalo New York figuring out what to do with all the empty industrial buildings because they went somewhere else and I don't mean they went to three and four story industrial building on a brownfield at the Port of Portland. They left the state and Oregon which is already one of the worst jobs producing places in America becomes the Mississippi of the west. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:40 AM
-
- 64.** Some of the things marked "somewhat important" above are, in fact, very important, but my impression is that the issues are being address through other measures/regulations/policies, which seem to be working. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:32 AM
-
- 65.** In regards to public-private funding special care must be taken. In situations where public funds are given for private projects that "benefit the public" there is a high chance for embezzlement. I think that we should be conservative with public funding in cases where private organizations should bear the cost. Thu, Oct 8, 2009 9:41 PM
-
- 66.** Any policy that favors new construction to resolve problems with congestion or to enhance economic opportunities must be constrained by Title 13 resources. Road "improvements" should not be allowed to degrade habitats designated for protection. RTP programs should make 0% contribution to the loss of special habitats of concern as measured through the Performance and Implementation Objectives and Indicators for Title 13. Thu, Oct 8, 2009 6:28 PM
-
- 67.** Wherever transportation and/or land-use decisions are made, due consideration should be given to efficient freight movement. Creating vibrant town centers (as contemplated in the 2040 planning effort, for example) requires more than making attractive main streets; they need to be functional for safe and efficient freight movement, deliveries and pick-ups, with adequate lane widths and heights, turning radius and safety considerations not unduly compromised by aesthetic notions and unconsidered priorities for predestrian, transit, bicycle uses. Without a well-planned freight system, the town center concept will inevitably be compromised by conflict and inefficiency. Thu, Oct 8, 2009 10:42 AM
-
- 68.** These are a bunch of sound bites and tricky ways to pour more money into roads and allow politicians to patronize big business. Thu, Oct 8, 2009 8:38 AM
-
- 69.** As someone once said, a vibrant economy starts with a job. Our area will not be livable nor the greatest place if we can't keep people employed. In order to supply jobs, our region needs the land (not just high density zoning) and the transportation system to sustain jobs - and not just the kinds of jobs that are Wed, Oct 7, 2009 1:39 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 119

skipped question 362

10. Comments:

part of a fad (coffee shops and boutiques).

70. More freight should be moved by rail; intermodal makes the best use of the advantages of road and freight. Tue, Oct 6, 2009 6:08 PM

71. Why is transit included in this question? "Remove major bottlenecks to benefit trucks, transit and passenger vehicles" Perhaps downtown Portland is a bottle neck for light rail, eventually a loop system that bypasses downtown should be considered. Existing conditions / peak hour congestion on several hwy corridors create bottlenecks for bus traffic, but the solution is less cars, not wider freeways. Tue, Oct 6, 2009 11:20 AM

72. Serve the job-producing entities. Downplay the importance of the individual. Lets get back to simple basics that pencil out economically for the best benefit on the whole, like replacing a bridge vs. putting in sidewalks in a neighborhood. We can't do it all and public-private funding partnerships are not going to create magic that opens doors on investment and projects. We have dwindling resources and the prognosis is for less in the pipeline for the next 25 years, so reduce your ambitious plans and stick to the very basic needs of the community. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 9:15 PM

73. Charge commercial freight haulers an adequate amount to compensate for the disproportionate amount of wear and tear they contribute to transportation routes. This is also true for the disproportionate amount it costs to build roads, bridges, etc, to allow for the heavier loads and increased traffic of these vehicles. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 3:08 PM

The comparison being, how much would it cost to build roads and bridges if they only had to carry passenger cars? How many lanes would be required? How expensive would the roadbed need to be if it only had to carry the weight of passenger vehicles? The difference in cost of building the lighter roads versus the heavier roads is what commercial carriers should be paying for.

This is not to say that commercial carriers should be discouraged, only that the cost be apportioned correctly, so consumers can make informed choices. If we want to pay for goods shipped farther, we can. If not, we won't.

74. The focus should be on over-the-road options, as that serves the greastest number of people and businesses. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 5:06 AM

75. I am not very familiar with this subject and so have no particular opinion. Sun, Oct 4, 2009 6:34 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 119

skipped question 362

10. Comments:

76. any chance we could get a system like they have in Europe - trucks only pass through @ certain times, thus freeing up the highway during the day, for instance. trucks travel on weekend & at night. i'd love to see that here.. Sun, Oct 4, 2009 4:11 PM
-
77. We are too deperent upon interstate trucking. We need more emphasis on local delivery: bringing goods to people instead of multiple auto trips to stores and groceries. Sun, Oct 4, 2009 2:32 PM
-
78. Public-Private fundnging partnership never benefits the public. Sat, Oct 3, 2009 4:24 PM
-
79. Novel delivery systems should be developed, e.g., perhaps pneumatic tubes, automated underground rail. Sat, Oct 3, 2009 1:52 PM
-
80. With higher fuel prices, rail will become more important. We need to focus on moving freight capacity to rail as much as possible. Sat, Oct 3, 2009 6:57 AM
-
81. Get the trucks off the roads! Use the rail system. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:02 PM
-
82. Well you said it! Getting traffic off the roads by providing safe and continuous bike paths is the best thing that can happen. And it is the most cost effective. Pick a town in Europe like Paris or Zurich and study it! One other thing: Make it manditory to have an urban planner look at delivery truck access to businesses to prevent congestion and inability of the trucks to swing into the delivery area from the main street without circling through neighborhoods. Consider limiting delivery times to off hours. Make this effective now! Cities should be required to address this issue immediatly, as soon as the problem emerges and to put a plan in effect to fix the routing or delivery access or delivery times and be respectful of neighborhoods and the impact on through traffic. Delivery trucks frequently come through our neighborhood to get to the shopping center because they can't swing the turn off Hwy 43. A restaurant on Hwy 43 has delivery trucks stopping and blocking one lane of Hwy 43 that sometimes deliver at peak traffic hours. The City is working to stop this without adversely affecting the deliveries but more attention needs to be given to delivery truck access where multiple jurisdictions (ODOT, City of LO) are an issue. Note that in an ideal world the lane being blocked would be clearly designated as joint use with bikes, buses and traffic that is turning right only. So blocking this lane with delivery trucks is a step back from the direction needed. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 2:44 PM
-
83. I don't have time to comment on this extensively at present other than for the N Wilsonville- Sherwood- Hwy 99 corridor. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 2:36 PM
-
84. You are still living in a dream world if you think improved and improving pedestrian/bicycle has helped our freight transportation problems!! If we were Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:23 AM

250 responses per page

answered question 119

skipped question 362

10. Comments:

in FL. or Calif.--maybe would be more of an impact..Of course you could use Metro's plan and build one very large/tall building--maybe two and move everybody into them--than no more transportation problems???!!

85. #2 about bottlenecks for all traffic, not just freight and transit Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:58 AM

86. I have repeatedly used Amtrak's Oregon City depot for train trips. Whatever freight solutions we agree upon, it's been important to me, my family, my friends and lots of people I don't know that Oregon City remain connected to the world via Amtrak. I know that UP owns those rails, but we need passenger trains as well. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:47 AM

87. You improve the transportation system for freight, the local communities would attract more business and you have less commuting and road failures. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:20 AM

88. Private industry which reaps the rewards of profits should share the costs and responsibilities of public investment. I am not as interested in spending money to attract business ans I am in business spending money to justify their use of resources. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 8:15 AM

89. The freight transportation to Washing Co. from Mult. Co. needs more and better highways connecting the two areas. Slow traffic, long weights on the bridges, increase CO2 emissions. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:54 AM

90. While I believe that all of this is very important, I also believe that quality of life issues surrounding noise and pollution should be addressed for people living near rail and industry. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:44 AM

91. Industries have always succeeded in the past without making the roads and access so desireable. That's why they are called industrial areas Fri, Oct 2, 2009 3:58 AM

92. The more we can do to get drivers out of their cars for small trips and to reduce amount of peak time trips the better we can keep freight and business moving without huge freeway and interchange investments. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 8:52 PM

93. freight industry is moving toward larger and larger vehicles/capacity on the road system. This increased capacity should be accommodated on rail - not the road system. Freight is dangerous to bicyclists, pedestrians, and others on the roads. Freight is also extremely expensive to move on the road system because most of the costs of road maintenance are the result of heavy freight vehicles.. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 8:19 PM

94. Work harder to encourage freight companies to use smaller/less polluting vehicles for a more sustainable delivery for the urban core. These "last mile" Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:54 PM

250 responses per page

answered question **119**

skipped question **362**

10. Comments:

deliverys can be made by bike, electric car, or smaller autos that can travel through tighter streets easier, take up less road space and pollute less. See <http://b-linepdx.com/> as a good example of what I'm talking about.

95. Optimize transportation for freight but don't optimized for cars that have other options (public transportation). Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:22 PM

96. We should not allow hazardous materials (like nuclear contaminants, etc) to crowd and endanger our vulnerable transport systemways. We already allow this to a certain degree. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:35 PM

97. We do not want more trucks on the roads. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:21 PM

98. in the 'ensure access for delivery' provision, opportunities for car-free access must also be developed Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:54 PM

in the 'improve major street connections' provision, the preponderance of the cost should be borne by the industries concerned

the last 3 provisions are nonsensical, as written. the cast doubt on the legitimacy of the entire survey. this is all just PR, right?

99. At some point we need to look at the "West Side Bypass" which is a freeway loop around the west side of the Metro region. This would provide another way for cars and trucks passing through the region to avoid local congestion. This would tie into I-5 in the LaCenter to Salmon Creek region, cross the Columbia and go over / through the mountains Cornelius Pass / German town area, pass near Hillsboro, and tie in to I-5 again near Wilsonville. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:49 PM

100. The railroads are going to abuse whatever incentive is provided. They have a lot of money! Don't give them any. Provide the means for them to develop what is needed, without public funding. If you dangle a buck under their nose, they will inconvenience customers and the public for as long as it takes to get something for nothing. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:15 PM

101. Avoid privatization of roads and transportation systems, this is bad Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:14 PM

102. Is public-private funding shorthand for sticking new developments with costs of public improvements? Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:02 PM

103. Get more freight moving on rail. Intermodal should be better developed and used extensively. Require all new industrial facilities to have rail access. Restore rail access to industrial sites where it has been removed. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:45 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 119

skipped question 362

10. Comments:

- 104.** I hope your statistician can reconcile answers that are illogical when juxtapositioned with each other. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:12 PM
-
- 105.** If it's a good project, it doesn't need gov't funding. Rail freight is not needed WITHIN the region. Developers should pay for street connections to their development. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:11 PM
-
- 106.** Limit truck movements to low traffic times. Work with businesses to stock or ship goods during off-peak hours Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:05 PM
-
- 107.** Again these all sound good. As a user of passenger rail I am very interested in seeing freight congestion significantly reduced so that passenger rail can be more dependable. I would also like to see high speed rail similar to what exists in Europe and Japan. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:57 PM
-
- 108.** Use tolling and/or congestion pricing to manage SOV demand at bottleneck points to free up capacity for freight. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:53 PM
-
- 109.** You can protect WITHOUT expanding! Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:37 PM
-
- 110.** Why is there no truck-specific road. How about a truck-only lane from Salem to Vancouver? Then they can pay what it takes to keep up the road and the rest of us can have safer less expensive driving. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:29 PM
-
- 111.** Again - innovative approaches to freight are called for. Increase in the use of rail. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:22 PM
One potential solution to freight deliveries is a system of rail to shipping centers and then local delivery via electric assist bikes.
Money should be used to educate the public to purchase less crap. I know this is practically anti-American but it is critical to the future of our species. We are using our planet's resources at a completely un-sustainable rate. The growth economy and the vast wealth it creates for a tiny minority has to end. PUBLIC funds should not be used to support the system designed to make the rich even more rich. PUBLIC funds should be used to make the lives of the GENERAL PUBLIC better and ensure a future for all.
-
- 112.** Private-public partnerships are not all that they are cracked up to be. Where I come from (Sydney, Australia)), the public-private partnerships used to build some major road infrastructure projects like a cross-city tunnel, and a freeway tunnel through the suburbs have been public funding disasters. The government has had to bail out the private consortium of one project, and now is saddled with a contract that is very unfavorable to the taxpayers. Another public-private rail extension project to the airport is not profitable, and is Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:20 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 119

skipped question 362

10. Comments:

loathed because of the more than double cost charged for tickets compared to other rail commuting in the city. BEWARE!

113. It's all public funding silly. We ultimately pay the bill. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:16 PM

114. I would prefer that commuting by automobile be annoying enough to induce transit use. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:12 PM

115. I remember how the truck lobby persuaded state legislators to raise weight limits for loads and soon thereafter all the bridges needed to be replaced. DON'T BE A SERVANT OF LOBBIES. Rail operators do not play well with others. Mandate freight rail operate on schedules so that track can be shared with passenger rail. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:08 PM

116. Provide control of excessively large truck (ones that are larger than delivery vans) from residential streets. Where possible use rail to move freight rather than trucks. Mon, Sep 28, 2009 3:37 PM

117. Limit the size of trucks allowed on city streets other than major arterials designed for them. These huge trucks have no place in residential neighborhoods or pedestrian-intensive shopping/entertainment districts. Mon, Sep 28, 2009 2:46 PM

118. Freeways, Highways, Roads! Wed, Sep 16, 2009 6:43 PM

119. businesses benefit from a lot of these improvements. I like the idea of partnering for funding when it benefits the businesses themselves. Tue, Sep 15, 2009 8:02 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 119

skipped question 362

11. If more funds were invested in freight improvements, what other types of investment should be decreased?

Response Count

 [Hide replies](#) 129

answered question 129

skipped question 352

11. If more funds were invested in freight improvements, what other types of investment should be decreased?

- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| 1. The railroad should have to pay for all or most of the improvements they need to be a more responsible public utility. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:20 PM |
| 2. Expanding UGB. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:44 PM |
| 3. Mass Transit | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:12 PM |
| 4. Weight limit increases for trucks have destroyed out hwy's. This survey is slanted to direct outcomes to increase more taxes and not protect Americans from wasteful spending. Have the wealthy pay their fair share!!!! | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:45 PM |
| 5. New highways & roads. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:28 PM |
| 6. THERE IS ONLY ONE CLEAR SOLUTION TO ANY TRAFFIC PROBLEM AND THAT IS TO INVEST IN A REGION WIDE WESTERN BYPASS CONNECTING 26 WITH I-5. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:34 PM |
| 7. Big freeways should be decreased | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:30 PM |
| 8. There is a fine line between fixing current bottle necks and expansion, please keep a very long term view on gas prices when fixing bottle necks. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:06 PM |
| 9. Transit, Bike | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 11:38 AM |
| 10. Decrease the millions of dollars spent debating a baseball stadium at Memorial Coliseum and near Clackamas. Decrease money subsidized for excess commuters. How? Decrease \$ to Parks and Rec if they continue allowing the emphasis on youth programs winning the game instead of developing and teaching each player on the team. Why do third and fourth grade football teams need to keep score? Why do they have only a ten play minimum for all players? How many grandparents walk away wondering what it takes to get playing time for their grandchildren? How many individual cars of parents go to these youth games without virtually any carpooling at all? Why must all youth games be so short and therefore more frequent? Why can the games be longer so more can play while there? Maintaining these fields is not cheap nor fuel efficient. What is Park and Rec's field maintenance fuel bill? | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:07 AM |
| 11. Fees should be increased for truck deliveries and usage of highways and bridges. Trucks are heavier than passenger cars and damage the highways and bridges more. Increased construction costs are incurred as a result of the heavy loads carried by trucks. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:42 AM |
| 12. Mass transit. I believe automobiles are the vehicles of the foreseeable future. I don't know why we would invest billions in a project that encourages crime and | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:25 AM |

250 responses per page

answered question 129

skipped question 352

11. If more funds were invested in freight improvements, what other types of investment should be decreased?

may be worthless in several years.

13.	light and heavy rail expansion	Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:54 AM
14.	I don't believe that additional fund should be specifically invested into freight improvements if it would require other investments to be decreased.	Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:48 AM
15.	Don't build new roads.	Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:23 AM
16.	Non essential government spending.	Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:20 AM
17.	public mass transit rail ie max should be stopped, the street car shold be stpped, wes should be stopped	Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:32 AM
18.	We are not a major manufacturing country!	Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:11 PM
19.	Transit, sidewalks	Wed, Oct 14, 2009 3:32 PM
20.	Less money on more highway lanes and bridges.	Wed, Oct 14, 2009 1:59 PM
21.	Multi-lane highways and bridges	Wed, Oct 14, 2009 1:43 PM
22.	I would not invest more funds in this.	Wed, Oct 14, 2009 12:53 PM
23.	Roads and highways for single passenger automobiles. 2 HOV/freight lanes, 1 lane for single passenger vehicles on all roads and highways.	Wed, Oct 14, 2009 10:43 AM
24.	Hiway widenings and expansions that are not aesthetic improvements like those in northern Washington (retaining wall murals, landscaping, etc.).	Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:37 AM
25.	roads, highways	Wed, Oct 14, 2009 8:44 AM
26.	Again HCT has to be planned for and the community built toward it but let's not expend the money for the rail lines so far ahead of the ability to accomadate the density.	Wed, Oct 14, 2009 7:24 AM
27.	If we could expand the freight rail system we could get more trucks off of the roadways and our road maintenance costs would decrease and our traffic problems would improve.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 9:11 PM
28.	Not sure	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:00 PM
29.	Decrease everything that supports the antiquated mode of transportation called the automobile.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 6:47 PM
30.	Decrease highway funds to support rail freight.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 4:26 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 129

skipped question 352

11. If more funds were invested in freight improvements, what other types of investment should be decreased?

31. Reduce investments in new roads and road widening unless it has a specific orientation to adding transit, bicycle and walking to the mix.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 3:31 PM
32. tax appropriately, no cuts are necessary.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 3:29 PM
33. Reduce truck shipments and promote rail. (if possible)	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 2:54 PM
34. Highway expansion projects.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 2:48 PM
35. Less on mass transit.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 12:16 PM
36. a similar-percentage reduction in other areas	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 12:07 PM
37. it shouldn't be.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:31 AM
38. General highway and road projects.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:08 AM
39. If more funds were invested in freight improvements (preferably rail), investment in new roads that are redundant with currently available public transit options should be decreased. Those expenditures could also be offset by increased parking fees, tolls, and fees for freight improvements.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 10:52 AM
40. Lightrail transit, trails, sidewalks and bike facilities.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 10:28 AM
41. Transit.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:19 AM
42. More HOT lanes; fewer highway capacity expansion projects. And stop funding the CRC.	Tue, Oct 13, 2009 6:04 AM
43. Rail crossing improvements to keep trains from blowing their horns. Horns are fine.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:06 PM
44. Improve freight trains (quality of the rails and more of them) Have a separate rail for freight and one for passenger. Investment in roads would thereby be decreased because trucks really wear and tear the roads (also cause accidents to passenger cars).	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:30 PM
45. Single passenger vehicle lanes	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:21 PM
46. Again, limiting car-related infrastructure and maintenance projects would free up billions of dollars to increase freight project funding.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:10 PM
47. Funds for highway expansion.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:45 PM
48. industrial incentives	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:24 PM
49. Less for highways and the CRC.	Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:40 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 129

skipped question 352

11. If more funds were invested in freight improvements, what other types of investment should be decreased?

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 50. See previous notes ... | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:14 PM |
| 51. Traffic corridors that are new construction for road or surface driving vehicles. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:11 PM |
| 52. Roads and Highways | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:09 PM |
| 53. All non essential tansit spending. ie: bike lanes on the streets. Put them on the sidewalk or license their use on public streets. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:37 AM |
| 54. I think bike transportation systems need to be focused on high density core areas only. I am suburban recreational biker who rides for exercise and enjoyment. When capacity for cars buses and trucks are improved there should be added capacity for bikes.

I spent three weeks last year traveling from Amsterdam to Budapest via Germany. At all of the major cities we toured on the rivers bridges were a key to their transportation system. Most of the bridges had been wiped out in WWII. Many cities had built bridges and added bridges to support their economy.

We just spend money planning and not doing. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:42 AM |
| 55. Transit. | Sun, Oct 11, 2009 7:14 AM |
| 56. Rail based transit. | Sun, Oct 11, 2009 1:22 AM |
| 57. Not sure if this should increase or stay the same as budgeted. Emphasize projects that can reduce the number of trucks (such as rail projects) while maintaining or growing freight capacity. | Sat, Oct 10, 2009 1:00 PM |
| 58. Reduce mass transit funding | Sat, Oct 10, 2009 9:11 AM |
| 59. Reduce funding for widening highways. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:57 PM |
| 60. Spending which is largely recreational (trails), expensive for the dollars invested and results obtained (WES, Sellwod Bridge 2 lane replacement) or enhances our national "reputation" without economic benefit. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:00 PM |
| 61. Transit | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 12:24 PM |
| 62. Mass transit, especially commuter rail. It's simply an efficient luxury we can ill afford. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:40 AM |
| 63. more government riff raff? | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:38 AM |
| 64. City, State, & County administration. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:36 AM |

250 responses per page

answered question 129

skipped question 352

11. If more funds were invested in freight improvements, what other types of investment should be decreased?

65. Roads	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:24 AM
66. bicycle funding	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:09 AM
67. More research is needed for my to make a comment.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:59 AM
68. How about increasing revenue sources instead of decreasing investment.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:50 AM
69. See previous comments	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:44 AM
70. Freeway and Arterial capacity. Thus you need to protect capacity and build some infrastructure.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:40 AM
71. Investments that are primarily focused on the movement of passenger vehicles.	Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:32 AM
72. Cut waste	Thu, Oct 8, 2009 9:41 PM
73. New roads and road expansions into natural areas. Again, the Sunnybrook extension is prime example of the type of project that is not worth the investment considering the natural resources at risk.	Thu, Oct 8, 2009 6:28 PM
74. Incentives to ship freight by rail rather than by truck.	Thu, Oct 8, 2009 9:47 AM
75. Roads and new highways	Thu, Oct 8, 2009 8:45 AM
76. Do not invest public noney helping railroads and truckers. They have subsidized for decades.	Thu, Oct 8, 2009 8:38 AM
77. Stop widening and "improving" highways and major arterials.	Tue, Oct 6, 2009 6:08 PM
78. Decrease spending on new roads unless they are directly related to accessing employment areas.	Tue, Oct 6, 2009 3:38 PM
79. I do not recommend investing more funds in freight improvements.	Tue, Oct 6, 2009 11:20 AM
80. Light rail, public transportation in general. People have to live closer to where they work.	Mon, Oct 5, 2009 9:15 PM
81. Highways, transit, bridges.	Mon, Oct 5, 2009 12:49 PM
82. Maintenance costs need to be reduced through more intelligent re-surfacing and BANNING CHAINS AND STUDS.	Mon, Oct 5, 2009 9:18 AM
83. High capacity light rail 24/7. Fund during rush hours and much less during other times... mostly the trains are empty off hours.	Mon, Oct 5, 2009 5:50 AM
84. Less on light rail and bike lanes	Mon, Oct 5, 2009 5:06 AM

250 responses per page

answered question 129

skipped question 352

11. If more funds were invested in freight improvements, what other types of investment should be decreased?

- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 85. freight improvements should be paid for by freight companies. | Sun, Oct 4, 2009 4:11 PM |
| 86. Systems management and operations. | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 6:46 PM |
| 87. Stop investing in METRO | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 4:24 PM |
| 88. money spent to promote increasing Metro's population. | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 11:10 AM |
| 89. Capacity investments for trucks (like removing current bottlenecks) would be one to consider. | Sat, Oct 3, 2009 6:57 AM |
| 90. New highways. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:29 PM |
| 91. To take the case in question, access to the shopping center near our neighborhood for delivery trucks, please think about not putting a 600 vehicle parking garage on top of this congestion as is planned by Metro to accommodate extending the street car rails into this shopping center. This is just an extra block of track but it crosses Foothills Drive and requires rearranging businesses and all for no reason other than to avoid having the parking and terminus in the vacant area where the trolley terminus is now because "we might want to do something different there in the future". So not extending the track to this shopping center would save a few million and allow the intersection to be improved for the delivery trucks without having to accommodate the traffic and queueing to the 600 space (400 new parking spaces and 200 to replace the ones taken up by the parking garage footprint) parking garage. Again, just a brief session with urban planners, some folks that can estimate costs and some far-sighted scientists would allow improving the delivery truck access while saving millions of dollars using design concepts that would suit the neighborhood and the public in general. It seems like a slam-dunk if finances are considered in the plans instead of a stubborn need to pursue a consolidation of "habitat" that may or may not be present in the two parks, George Rogers and Foothills over the protestations of the public. The key is to get public support and confidence in these projects so the investment will be supported and not get into needless controversies. That's my two cents anyway. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 2:44 PM |
| 92. tax or higher license fees and checks for semi- tractors pulling more than one trailer. or ban them. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:30 AM |
| 93. If you improve people movement with better roads/hiways---this goes a lone ways in improving freight---Just putting in a couple og limited by passes with tolls or without would take care of much of the problem. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:23 AM |

250 responses per page

answered question 129

skipped question 352

11. If more funds were invested in freight improvements, what other types of investment should be decreased?

94. Reconsider major HCT projects -- i.,e., compare benefits and costs of HCT to freight investments.	Fri, Oct 2, 2009 10:14 AM
95. non-self sustaining	Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:58 AM
96. Mass transit.	Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:20 AM
97. new highway construction.	Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:08 AM
98. Private money should be invested in profit making enterprise	Fri, Oct 2, 2009 8:15 AM
99. mass transit	Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:54 AM
100. Less funding should be given to administrative expenses. Although commuter fares seem just right currently, expected increases in fuel prices should trigger higher fares. Fares should be more competitive than what driving costs, but we should not be giving away any money either.	Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:34 AM
101. trails and nice to have projects	Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:32 AM
102. build and enlarge fewer highways.	Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:13 AM
103. I dont think more funds should be invested	Fri, Oct 2, 2009 3:58 AM
104. No more money for freight, or move from highways to rail.	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 8:19 PM
105. We should not decrease funding in other areas at this time, thank you. Also, instead of building a bigger bridge, what about a tunnel underneath the river? Has this been considered as an alternative or would it be too expensive? Thanks.	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:35 PM
106. Build less roads.	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:21 PM
107. fraudulent surveys	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:54 PM
108. No public funds for private business.	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:15 PM
109. get the money from tolls on highways during peak hours.	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:14 PM
110. Again, stop adding lanes and expanding highways and arterials -- they're plenty wide enough.	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:45 PM
111. Transit and bikes	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:38 PM
112. Highway widening projects.	Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:36 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 129

skipped question 352

11. If more funds were invested in freight improvements, what other types of investment should be decreased?

- | | | |
|------|---|---------------------------|
| 113. | Accommodation of the car with driver and many other passengers, vs. the car with driver and few or zero passengers. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:12 PM |
| 114. | transit | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:11 PM |
| 115. | Downtown improvements are a waste of time and money. Cut off all expenditures. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:05 PM |
| 116. | Mass Transit. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:57 PM |
| 117. | trails, bicycle paths, sidewalks, light rail | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:53 PM |
| 118. | Mass Transit. We have invested enough. We need to focus on existing system capacity and expansion | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:46 PM |
| 119. | Mass transit allocations. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:37 PM |
| 120. | I do not recommend more freight investment | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:24 PM |
| 121. | Reduce the inflexible means of transportation, including streetcars and light rail routes. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:19 PM |
| 122. | rail | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:16 PM |
| 123. | The CRC, of course, and any tax breaks to "sports developers" and parking facilities. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:12 PM |
| 124. | Freight transportation broke our bridges and we had to buy new ones. Let them pay for their own improvements | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:08 PM |
| 125. | If the above are worked on that should be enough. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:02 PM |
| 126. | Decrease funds for staff dedicated to preventing expansion of the urban growth boundary. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 1:54 PM |
| 127. | new highways / freeways. | Mon, Sep 28, 2009 3:37 PM |
| 128. | Again, you're not suggesting any choices. | Mon, Sep 28, 2009 2:46 PM |
| 129. | Bike, mass transit and anything else that is not Freeway, Highway, Roads! | Wed, Sep 16, 2009 6:43 PM |

250 responses per page

answered question 129

skipped question 352

12. The region's transportation system is funded through a combination of federal, state, regional and local sources. Federal funds are given to this region with different requirements on how the money can be spent. The state generates funds through a series of user fees that are constitutionally limited to road use, including a gas tax, weight-mile tax for heavy trucks, vehicle/truck registration fees and drivers' license fees. Local sources include city and county gas taxes, dedicated property tax levies, parking revenues and fees on new development. TriMet and SMART collect transit funds through fares and local business payroll tax. Currently, there is a growing shortage of funding to adequately repair or build highways, roads, bridges, sidewalks, bike facilities and transit lines. Today the federal government is investing less in local transportation than ever before, and state and local transportation sources are limited. While budgets are shrinking, aging roads and bridges are operating beyond capacity, more freight is moving in the region, and more people are walking, biking and using transit than ever before. In order to fund the region's transportation priorities, several funding sources are being explored. Rate your support for the following funding options.

	strongly support	somewhat support	neutral	somewhat oppose	strongly oppose	Response Count
Household street maintenance fees to fund road and bridge repairs	12.0% (42)	18.6% (65)	22.3% (78)	24.9% (87)	22.1% (77)	349
County regional vehicle registration fees to fund capital investments like highways, roads and bridges	24.4% (85)	39.4% (137)	13.5% (47)	8.9% (31)	13.8% (48)	348
Increases in local development impact fees (system development charges) to fund capital investments like highways, roads, bridges, sidewalks and bicycle facilities	36.9% (128)	29.1% (101)	17.3% (60)	8.1% (28)	8.6% (30)	347
Increases in state gas taxes and vehicle registration fees to fund maintenance and capital investments for highways, roads, bridges, sidewalks, and bicycle facilities	47.7% (166)	27.3% (95)	10.9% (38)	4.9% (17)	9.2% (32)	348
Increases in the TriMet payroll tax to fund transit operations and expansion of the region's transit system	14.1% (49)	24.7% (86)	24.7% (86)	15.8% (55)	20.7% (72)	348
Tolls to fund maintenance and capital investments	33.3% (116)	23.6% (82)	10.9% (38)	10.9% (38)	21.3% (74)	348
					answered question	352
					skipped question	129

13. Comments:

**Response
Count**

 [Hide replies](#)

142

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| <p>1. Personally, I wish we could work towards one car per household. I know this isn't a perfect solution (roommates, for example) but if we have to pay \$500 to park that second car (no matter if we live in an apartment, house, or whatever, it is going to change the desirability of transit. Who knows, maybe a volunteer public committee could be formed to review requests for waivers due to special needs (disability, roommates, families with jobs that aren't accommodated by transit system, etc)</p> | <p>Fri, Oct 16, 2009 2:54 AM</p> |
| <p>2. Individuals, businesses and industry that want access during peak hours should have to pay a fee or toll if they choose to use the highways and roads during those times.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:22 PM</p> |
| <p>3. How about we look at the number of ODOT employees and how we can sink government.
And no more trams and streetcars.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:29 PM</p> |
| <p>4. Why can't government do the same thing they did historically? Even with increased population using more gas ,paying higher fees and more taxes,and inflation creating more tax revenue, government constantly consumes more as a percentage! We need less talk and more action. The public is fed up!</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:17 PM</p> |
| <p>5. I'm generally against fees. I'd rather see a small sales tax than fees popping up all over.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 4:25 PM</p> |
| <p>6. This survey is slanted to direct outcomes to increase more taxes and not protect Americans from wasteful spending. Have the wealthy pay their fair share!!!!</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:48 PM</p> |
| <p>7. If you want support for funding measures, demonstrate that we're not investing in lost causes, and demonstrate that the costs are distributed fairly. We could all afford to pay more for the privilege of driving, and the more you drive, the more you should pay - fuel taxes are ideal for this. The mileage of the vehicle in some ways represents its impacts, beyond traffic and congestion impacts. We need to be using a hell of a lot less fuel anyway.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:32 PM</p> |
| <p>8. I support tolls as long as they are removed once the cost of building the bridge/road has been raised.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 3:18 PM</p> |

250 responses per page

answered question 142

skipped question 339

13. Comments:

9. I would like a transportation tax based on your proximity to downtown portland...seems this whole system has been implemented to serve downtown portland yes? Tax those individuals the most who benefit the most from using the system..downtown residents and businesses...tax those the least who are least likely to use the system..like someone who lives out in Canby or Forest Grove. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 2:22 PM
-
10. Tolls are a best idea. People initially complain but later we get better bridges/bike lanes/roads. Developers need to pay for the developement they cause. Not the existing citizens. Or there should not be more land developed. Improve SE portland instead, ect. I would like a sustainable region , not a million person growth region. We need to preserve and improve what we have. Not sprawl and destroy our valuable nature that is left. No more growth is ideal. Have bigger buildings downtown for people to live and do business in. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:42 PM
-
11. WHETHER THEY ARE TERMED TAXES, FEES, OR INVESTMENTS ALL NEW MONEY IS A TAX ON PEOPLE PAID FOR BY AND SHOULD ONLY BE APPROVED BY A VOTE OF ALL CONSTITUENTS AND IDENTIFIED SPECIFICALLY AS A TAX. THE ONLY OTHER ALTERNATIVE IS TOLLS WHEREBY PEOPLE CAN CHOOSE TO PAY OR NOT PAY. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:38 PM
-
12. By all means, charge developers for 100% of what their operations cost the public. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 12:40 PM
-
13. I would like to see Weight based+Mileage+studded snow based road usage fees, if you are tearing up the road you pay for it. This fee should be extended to bicycles as well. GPS based systems have been deployed successfully in other areas. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 11:40 AM
-
14. No more crime ridden light rail and there will be money for road projects. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 11:21 AM
-
15. In your above text, Metro claims fees an new development is a possible source. Almost all city governments seem to always let developers skirt/avoid sidewalk fees. Yes, developers may build sidewalks and road improvement around their immediate development. But Metro's category of Regional trails does not include: correcting the Lack of linking/continous sidewalks between developments developed at different times. If the developer builds before an nearby developer does, why can't the plan/fee be for future continous sidewalks linking filling conitnous sidewalks/bike paths be put in an escrow type fund. All over the array of suburbs are patches of unconnected sidewalks, is that required in the defintion of how to build suburbs? Is walking between urban/suburb developments on sidewalks to the local main intersection always Thu, Oct 15, 2009 10:24 AM

250 responses per page

answered question 142

skipped question 339

13. Comments:

23. Get rid of unnecessary management and use those funds to pot. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 7:21 AM
-
24. The tax/fee burden should be placed on automobile drivers to encourage them to alter their behavior (much as we tax cigarettes). Thu, Oct 15, 2009 7:08 AM
-
25. I think this batch of questions outline the intent of the survey. No blessing from me on any tax or fee increase. Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:22 AM
-
26. USE THE BUDGET YOU HAVE, NO MORE TAXES Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:33 AM
-
27. Stop shoving all these taxes down our throats to fund projects that are not cost effective. Incorporate mass transit into new roads built for future developments. Portland area residents are not interested in becoming another New York. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 6:39 PM
-
28. You guys are so funny. Not once is there an option listed that doesn't involve raising the taxes or imposing a toll. As you can see I'm opposed to all taxation avenues to fund improvements. Instead of asking an already overburdened taxpayer, consider utilizing existing roads rather than building new ones; consider expanding them or making a reversible lane to accommodate heavy traffic times. Time the street lights to move traffic through more smoothly. Educate the public via TV, radio, and DRIVER EDUCATION about the best flow of traffic on the freeways and 4 lane roads. Drivers can only move as fast as the slowest car in front, keep right except to pass. Review the successes with this protocol in Australia. After all the simple stuff has been implemented THEN come to me with your hand out and we'll talk. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 4:15 PM
-
29. Many fees here are aimed at vehicles. So your strategy is to remove vehicles from the roads so now you have no source of fees. Charge a bike registration fee, lets make it fair. I also bike and would be willing to pay a fee to go towards additional bike facilities. Vehicle fees go to new vehicle facilities, that seems fair. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 3:37 PM
-
30. When using tolls and various fees, Metro needs to be sure these extra costs do not place more burden on those in poverty. People who ride Transit already may not be able to afford a big hike in fees. However, if you are choosing to ride a car on the road everyday you are putting wear and tear on the road and emitting pollution so that person should pay an increased fee to cover their costs. The United States subsidizes driving personal vehicles but not public transportation that much so I think these realities and true costs of driving need to be thought about when increasing fees and taxes and other techniques and what populations do those increases affect. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 3:31 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 142

skipped question 339

13. Comments:

31. #4 - Increase in state gas taxes and registration fees: I wanted to check both strongly support and strongly oppose as this should have been 2 questions. I strongly support a large increase in the gas tax as this collects more money from those that use the road system the most, and also encourages the use of transit and bikes, and based on gas prices the past 2 years, encourages people to buy more fuel efficient cars. I am strongly opposed to increasing the registration fee as this charges people no matter how much they drive. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 2:07 PM

32. Tax and fee increases only as needed to maintain current roadway infrastructure. Need to develop new funding strategies to improve and expand high capacity passenger and freight transportation. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 12:19 PM

33. I feel that the funds should come proportionally from those who use the roads on a regular basis. I don't like the idea of being charged equally for the up-keeping of highways or roads that I don't use as much as others. I would strongly support a tax on vehicle miles traveled, if there was an equitable way to do this. At this point, tolling seems to be the fairest way to generate funds based on usage. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 11:57 AM

34. More infrastructure bonds. Give the public their own choice to invest in their region. 1 bond fund for highways, 1 bond fund for transit, 1 bond fund for bridges, etc. Then see who supports which priority most. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 10:48 AM

35. They use tolls all over the East Coast and Midwest. All the bridges in the San Francisco area also have tolls. We are really behind in not using them. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:39 AM

36. as stated earlier if all vehicles were legal and proper fines for lawlessness were applied and directed to fund we could pay for some of this., Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:09 PM

37. Here's another option: Hey, Oregon! Hey, Portland! Hire an Oregonian first. The benefits to the economy are countless. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 6:50 PM

38. We should have at least European levels of gas tax to discourage driving, fund transit, and build post-automobile infrastructure. High gas prices will change behavior, reducing congestion. The behavioral changes that high gas taxes will precipitate will help Oregon prepare for the disruptive increase in gas prices that will come when demand significantly exceeds supply. If Oregon makes this transition before other regions, when the disruptive change comes we will be at a competitive advantage. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 4:30 PM

39. Tolls only on new infrastructure Tue, Oct 13, 2009 3:35 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 142

skipped question 339

13. Comments:

40. Refer to the voters a constitutional amendment that would allow state fuel taxes and vehicle fees to be used to fund intercity public transportation, which currently has no dedicated revenue source. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 2:49 PM

41. I generally support usage taxes/tolls/fees to help finance our transportation needs Tue, Oct 13, 2009 1:04 PM

42. Tolls are favored. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 12:41 PM

43. Concentrate on existing structures, maximizing their performance and use. Stop taxing to build new stuff. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:33 AM

44. I do not generally support fees, especially fees based on household or residency. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:13 AM

I STRONGLY support raising the state gas tax. I would further like to see that tax pegged to inflation so that we no longer need to arbitrarily raise it every so often, (or avoid raising it as the case has been.) Taxes such as the gas tax are directly tied to transportation system user behavior and therefore are more equitable, as they can be controlled by that user.

I also believe that we must charge developers more to ensure that adequate transportation infrastructure is constructed.

Lastly I do not believe tolls are an adequate or workable solution for urban transportation. They may serve a purpose for the funding of limited infrastructure such as bridges (when there is no alternative routing to avoid the toll) but I believe that if we enacted a toll on urban freeways, for example, we would only see traffic diverting to surface streets. I strongly support the notion of tolling for Interstates outside of the urban area, but I do not support tolling of them inside of the UGB.

45. Funding should come from sources based upon their actual usage of and impact on the infrastructure - not their proximity to that infrastructure. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:01 AM

Someone or some entity who lives on or near a major artery but primarily uses public transportation, walks, or bikes has a much smaller impact on the system than someone who lives far away but drives through or to that same artery. Their cost should be proportionate to that use and impact. To seek more funding from the former is not only unfair, but also serves to exacerbate the current problem.

250 responses per page

answered question 142

skipped question 339

13. Comments:

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 46. There should not be any increase in fee, unless it is off set by a tax credit!
There should be government accountability for where our current dollars are spent! | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 10:31 AM |
| 47. Implement tax on sales of tire chains and studs. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 10:24 AM |
| 48. There is plenty of money to support the necessary maintenance/improvements when you reduce transit expenditures to reflect the % of the population served.
Increase transit fares to reflect the real cost of ridership. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:22 AM |
| 49. let the primary users pay more. walkers and bicyclists use the services and should pay some, but not as much as the drivers/commuters. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:18 PM |
| 50. I'm opposed to building any new highways/roads | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:12 PM |
| 51. I strongly feel that we should not subsidize growth. The burdens imposed by future growth should be paid for by those imposing the increased demands. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:32 PM |
| 52. We currently pay maintenance fees and registration fees have also been sharply raised | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:21 PM |
| 53. I don't mind giving money to the government in order to improve transportation infrastructure but I do not like the idea of my money going toward projects that make it easier for passenger vehicles to get from place to place. It's already easy to drive. Our best alternatives to driving are cumbersome and lacking. I believe that money should be put into them in order to satisfy some the goals of this plan. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 6:46 PM |
| 54. Most in favor of tolls | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:23 PM |
| 55. Make driving cars more expensive, and their users will be encouraged to bike/walk/use public transit to arrive at their destinations, in turn allowing for decreased road maintenance investment. Increasing tolls, raising the gas tax, and increasing registration fees would all accomplish this goal. The TriMet payroll tax and SDC charges should also be increased to further back these goals of improving alternate-transit infrastructure, in the hopes that one day bike, foot, bus, and rail transit will no longer be referred to as alternate-transit, but simply "transit". | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 3:18 PM |
| 56. Since automobiles are responsible for most of the use -- and wear and tear -- of our roads, let's stop subsidizing automobile use and instead make automobile users subsidize roads more. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:57 PM |

250 responses per page

answered question 142

skipped question 339

13. Comments:

57. Funding sources should be used as a tool for encouraging commuters to choose transport modes that ensure a sustainable future for the region. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:48 PM
-
58. Many employers are stakeholders in the regions transportation system, yet have workers that commute from outside the METRO boundaries. They should pay their fair share for increasing the road and sprawl costs Mon, Oct 12, 2009 2:27 PM
-
59. Turn the freeways into community gardens and bike paths. Pass a progressive state sales tax that will equalize the tax burden and stabilize government budgets. I know I've voted against the sales tax in the past but I have finally seen the light ... Increase fees only where we are far below the national average. Taxing transit users is regressive, as is tolling. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:19 PM
-
60. items 3 and 4: I support only walking/bike or transit bridges, sidewalks and bicycle facilities. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:13 PM
-
61. I hate paying more just as much as the next person but spreading the fee out to everyone who benefits makes the most since and a gas tax is the only way I see reaching those who benefit from the road improvements. I think imposing fees on local developments will keep potential employers from moving closer to my home. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 12:12 PM
-
62. What are the core items in the buget? What recent regulations are having the most impact on cost without the promised value? Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:43 AM
-
63. User pays. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:18 AM
-
64. SDC's haven't shown that they can successfully work: conceptually a nice idea, but every attempt I've seen tried in Portland had problems. Household fees are a sore point for those of us who already pay our taxes etc etc and still live on unimproved or unpaved streets that are being even further degraded by policies encouraging in-fill building without appropriate infrastructure supports. Wouldn't necessarily be opposed if monies were clearly being effectively used to improve services for everyone and not jst a few influential neighborhoods or industries... Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:16 AM
-
65. It is too late to fix what is broken. You will need to do something but you have lost the trust of the people. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:30 AM
-
66. I am willing to support street maintenance fees for households; however, because of the significant backlog in street improvements and street maintenance in the SW, other sources of funding must be identified to offset an unfair burden on households. Again, the infrastructure of the SW has been Sun, Oct 11, 2009 12:58 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 142

skipped question 339

13. Comments:

overlooked for far too long yet we continue to be a site of infill development and experience both roadway and environmental degradation as a result. Developers must be more accountable for these impacts and must create infrastructure to accommodate the population growth and increased traffic in our neighborhoods.

-
67. Light rail is incredibly expensive. The WES was incredibly expensive, and for not much return. Stop spending money on rail projects. Sun, Oct 11, 2009 1:24 AM
-
68. Increase gas tax but do not use for sidewalks and bicycle facilities. Sat, Oct 10, 2009 9:13 AM
-
69. I believe public transportation should be supported mostly through income taxes on both business & individuals or sales taxes to the extent that using public transportation would be very economical as it is in Europe. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 9:47 PM
-
70. Tolls and gas taxes impact the users of the roads and bridges. SDC's provide money to build roads made necessary by development. This seems fair. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 2:38 PM
-
71. Secure more capital and operational funding for Paratransit and Community Transportation services. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:59 PM
-
72. decrease wasteful spending like mass transit and fix the roads. You'll have plenty of money left over. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:55 PM
-
73. Here's the rub. The trick is to extract more taxes and fees from the residents while not discouraging private sector job maintenance and growth. It's the private sector which ultimately will pay for all of this even if public sector entities chip in, it's the taxpayers who ultimately foot the bill. Vehicle fees and gas taxes are logical but if you are discouraging vehicles in general and reluctantly embrace green vehicles this may be self defeating as the number of vehicles in use VMD per person drops. SDCs have gone through the roof and are a drag on development now, there may not be much more room to raise them. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 1:24 PM

Because we don't have a sales tax, most people don't pay much of a share of the cost of government. A household tax holds some intrigue.

Decreasing the cost of government and reducing spending on less essential things is logical but realistically won't happen short of municipal bankruptcies or extreme public finance shortages which would allow resetting labor and other expectations.

I guess if you are convinced this is the greatest place to live, you have to get

250 responses per page

answered question 142

skipped question 339

13. Comments:

everyone to pay for it and in order to live here they will have to suffer a reduced standard of living.

-
- 74.** Take the ridiculous bicycle facilities out of the mix. As a separate item, yes, I'd support it. But not as part of every major project. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:43 AM
-
- 75.** none Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:39 AM
-
- 76.** Individuals currently pay high taxes for the luxury of our roads, granted more funds are needed but I would first focus on large companies who can pass the tax onto their clients. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:02 AM
-
- 77.** Tolling when there is a direct link between the toll and the transportation project. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:46 AM
-
- 78.** It's tough to do on a regional level. Some city's have done a better job than others so it becomes a wealth redistribution effort. The tragedy of the commons. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:42 AM
-
- 79.** Gas tax is unfair. Low MPG vehicles pay more per mile than high MPG vehicles. As cars get higher MPG gas tax collections will decrease. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:38 AM
-
- 80.** With the proliferation of bicycles and investments being made in infrastructure to accommodate this mode of transportation, cyclists should be required to register their bicycles and be issued a license plate similar to a vehicle. This would generate revenue and provide a mechanism for accountability in hopes that motor code compliance would be adhered to, thereby reducing the number of bicycle-related accidents and fatalities. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 9:20 AM
-
- 81.** A mileage based user fee is the only truly equitable source of funds. With this mechanism people would pay for what they used. Tue, Oct 6, 2009 7:50 PM
-
- 82.** Don't tax households for transportation improvements. People are trying not to lose their homes in this horrible economy. Increase the gas tax and spread the cost statewide. Charge tolls. People will prioritize, consolidate and otherwise manage their trips if the gas tax is increased and tolls are added. Tue, Oct 6, 2009 3:56 PM
-
- 83.** Tolls are regressive since everyone is charged the same regardless of income. This inevitably makes the cost of moving around to jobs, medical appointments, school, etc. more costly for the poor and lower-income folks. The legacy of freedom of movement on our road systems should not be abandoned lightly. What's wrong with taxing people appropriately so that there is enough money in the general fund to support necessary public infrastructure like roads and bridges without making people pay every time they need to go buy a loaf of

250 responses per page

answered question 142

skipped question 339

13. Comments:

bread?

- | | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| <p>84. I also support increased parking fees in downtown cores to limit auto traffic, and car parking fees at transit centers, to provide reliability. Additional secure bike parking at transit centers should be provided, I am willing to pay for this service, and car drivers should also pay for parking...</p> | <p>Tue, Oct 6, 2009 11:28 AM</p> |
| <p>85. Tax the hell out of gas. Its a user fee, the more you use, the more tax you pay. Don't like it, sell your vehicle and ride a bike. Don't raise payroll taxes, they are high enough funding Tri-Met.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 5, 2009 9:20 PM</p> |
| <p>86. Again, if commercial haulers paid their fare share, much of the necessary funding would be available.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 5, 2009 3:12 PM</p> |
| <p>87. Tolls should be initially used to fund capital investment within a specific corridor.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 5, 2009 8:28 AM</p> |
| <p>88. Gas taxes should focus on roads, highways, bridges, not bike paths and mass transit. Consider a bicycle registration fee to offset the cost of bike paths. Don't put this expense on businesses and gasoline tax.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 5, 2009 5:08 AM</p> |
| <p>89. We need to look at all options for maintaining our infrastructure. It is important to keep in mind the cumulative effect of all these taxes and fees on the individual and ensure that business and households are contributing in proportion to their use. We also need to protect low income people from excessive taxation.</p> | <p>Sun, Oct 4, 2009 7:01 PM</p> |
| <p>90. Trimet is very important to me. I would like to find another way to fund trimet. Any increase in funds should be put toward maintaining or improving existing service (bring back service that was cut this fall) before one dime is spent to expand service to new territories or build new lightrails.</p> | <p>Sun, Oct 4, 2009 6:37 PM</p> |
| <p>91. I generally agree that new development or new projects should be assessed fees that will fund their own infrastructure needs. However, there should be some room for subsidy in order to better direct growth to those areas that are part of the regional plan.</p> | <p>Sun, Oct 4, 2009 12:54 PM</p> |
| <p>92. There isn't a correlation between payroll tax and system use.</p> | <p>Sat, Oct 3, 2009 6:48 PM</p> |
| <p>93. Don't build it and they won't come.</p> | <p>Sat, Oct 3, 2009 4:29 PM</p> |
| <p>94. Take a look at what we did in Milwuakie to accomplish this.</p> | <p>Sat, Oct 3, 2009 11:11 AM</p> |

250 responses per page

answered question 142

skipped question 339

13. Comments:

95. Maybe study to identify all the different ways we subsidize the use of vehicles (cars, trucks) and try to assess more of those charges on the vehicles' owners and users. Sat, Oct 3, 2009 7:00 AM
-
96. Please read my previous comments. There is so much wasted resources already. Clean up the mess and then have another look at how much is needed. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:03 PM
-
97. Having said I support a gas tax, for example, I fully realize that this is politically impossible. The word tax on anything will never fly. The word fee might. The word fee is used when there is a direct connection to the benefit such as a bridge toll to pay for the bridge. If you think you will be able to get support for a "tax", think again. A fee, maybe. But it is all about public confidence and showing a direct connection and no harm to quality of life or property devaluation. Please remove plans that are not publicly supported and concentrate on ones that are and show a clear direct link on any funding requests. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 2:49 PM
-
98. Oregon needs to maximize federal funding strategies. The only toll I'd support would be over any new or existing bridge over the Columbia River, or on a few miles south of Siskiyou on I-5 to fund safety improvements on I-5 snow passages. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:35 AM
-
99. We have household maint.fees now---Gas tax ok if it goes to improve/build roads---not bike/ped transportation!You keep bring in the walking/bike faction--"more than ever before" which is really nothing and/or minimal impact in the overall picture of transportation movement!! Again you must have that "feel good" thing going for you even though it amounts to a fraction of a percent in moving people!! Fri, Oct 2, 2009 11:23 AM
-
100. I think things that benefit us all should be paid for by all... schools, libraries, police, firefighters, health care, food... here I get heretical, I know. We all benefit by a reliable road system, even if we're not drivers ourselves... we want our firefighters, UPS people, pizza deliveries, letter carriers, etc. to be able to get where they need to go, even if all we do is walk or bike. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:53 AM
-
101. We pay enough taxes now, but we do not spend it wisely. Make improvements with how you spend your money first, before even thinking about raised taxes or fees. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 9:22 AM
-
102. SDCs! If we are going to provide for 1 million new people, they need to help pay for the systems to support them. Yes, house prices may go up \$1,000. Maybe it's \$10,000. Fine. But we won't be having the roads falling apart, the

250 responses per page

answered question 142

skipped question 339

13. Comments:

schools overcrowded and the systems inadequate because ten people are trying to use a system built for three.

103. Mult Co. has found funds to develop the Water Front area and found that it is an extremely poor investment. The jobs that pay are outside the metropolitan area and people who are attracted to the high rise expensive apartments in the water front area have only low pay jobs in the local vicinity or must commute long distances to higher, on the average, paying jobs outside. The transportation money should be spent on getting workers to the job markets. The average commute is 11.4 miles for people living in the metropolitan area now, if they could live closer to their employment there would be far less need for mass transit and less emissions. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 8:03 AM

104. You didn't mention congestion tolling, perhaps this is an important step Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:28 AM

105. Find a way not to make the poor pay a disproportionate amount. I can't imagine how to do it, but taxes seem better than across-the-board fees. I hope there are "equity economists" who can figure this out. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:16 AM

106. Reduce other government spending Fri, Oct 2, 2009 12:45 AM

107. Very opposed to tolls Thu, Oct 1, 2009 9:12 PM

108. I support nearly any increase in revenue to help pay for needed improvements, but transit, bike, pedestrian, and freight should be prioritized over private automobile travel. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 8:21 PM

109. I would more strongly support the "Household street maintenance fees to fund road and bridge repairs" if I knew that those fees were kept local (in my city), not pooled into a larger fund and then re-distributed. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:55 PM

As a small business owner I have always disliked the TriMet payroll tax. We are getting taxed from every angle possible, and this is just another one. I would prefer it if it came out of the employee's paycheck rather than as a tax on business owners. Increasing or creating new taxes (like the TriMet payroll tax) and increasing cost of living due to the urban growth boundary will continue to make it difficult (if not impossible in some cases) to run a small business in the Metro area.

110. fee structure should be based on actual use of infrastructure. if you want to use, you pay. therefore tolls and gas taxes, which relate to actual use of facilities. vehicle registration fees are a flat tax, so someone like me who uses my car once per month pays the same as someone who drives every day, and Thu, Oct 1, 2009 7:26 PM

250 responses per page

answered question **142**

skipped question **339**

13. Comments:

that's not fair. pay to use.

111. The users should be charged. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:22 PM

112. Some areas that add tolls that would encourage mass transit and keep more cars off that road(such as is done in one area of So. Calif. east of Los Angeles) may be interesting to explore. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 5:31 PM

113. A toll when crossing from Vancouver to Portland would decrease the washington "suckers" that take advantage of our no sales tax and their no income tax. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:59 PM

114. increase trimet tax only to expand bus service Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:57 PM
tolls only in the sense of congestion pricing

115. Same comment on the tolls: only if electronically checked and vehicles do not have to slow down through the checkpoint. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:22 PM

116. Do NOT support increasing impact fees in any way to support bicycle facilities. TriMet payroll taxes are a huge burden for small businesses who receive, at best, small benefit from TriMet. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 4:06 PM

117. Be careful not to place too much reliance on one source. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:46 PM

118. Our transportation taxes are misused. Taxes are job killers. City of Portland is already over-taxed. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:16 PM

119. None. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:14 PM

120. If you want to work and live in an ant farm you should pay for it. I lived in Lonb Beach CA. for over three years while serving in the Navy. Having neighbors over, under and all around you is HELL. This is what you are promoting. This is NOT planning or progress for a QUALITY way of living. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:13 PM

121. Gas tax should not be used for non automotive projects. I don't believe the county would spend the money judiciously. I don't trust our government to spend the money appropriately. My neighborhood in SW lacks sidewalks connecting the various developments, but Sam Adams can waste money downtown with our tax dollars. I also don't like trimet's solution to decrease service in an economic downturn. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 3:07 PM

122. Would like to see those who use the roads providing funding to maintain them. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:58 PM

250 responses per page

answered question 142

skipped question 339

13. Comments:

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 123. I think the public sector needs to think more like the private sector when it comes to pay and benefits. I run a business and if I can't afford to hire an extra person that means I have to work harder and smarter. If I have only so much money, then benefits have to be cut, etc. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:58 PM |
| 124. Increase gasoline tax to 100%. Create tolls on bridges and roads. But do not roll those funds back into automobile centric facilities. Put them into electrified mass transit, bicycle, pedestrian and other human powered transportation systems and facilities. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:52 PM |
| 125. increase weight-mile tax for heavy trucks | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:46 PM |
| 126. The job creation in the Metro area is already hampered by the lack of developable industrial sites. At the present progression of industrial employment decrease the payroll-tax-paying employment base is not going to increas to bring in revenue. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:44 PM |
| 127. Get money out of the general fund to use | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:38 PM |
| 128. Create a small user fee/tax on bicycles, minimize transportation dollars for bicycle paths, they are a low priority as long as our present transportation infrastructure is in such poor condition! | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:37 PM |
| 129. people who use the roads/bridges should expect to pay for them | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:36 PM |
| 130. It is important that impact fees not be outrageously high when applied to expansion or relocation of existing businesses and activities. There are many bad examples in the case of Portland, and we know that Tigard lost (quite properly) in the US Supreme Court when it overreached. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:36 PM |
| 131. See previous comments about tolls and their effect on development. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:30 PM |
| 132. All transportation entities MUST show the public that they are using the monies they have now in an efficient manner. When we drive by highway projects and see people standing around (doing nothing) away from the working people, the first thought is that there are too many people on the job (wasting our money!). There should be better organization of duties for the 'down-time' employees, if it is just watching the people working and being in a position to help -- such as hand them tools, keeping the work area clear and safe, etc. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:24 PM |
| 133. Why not cut government expenditures such as payroll and benefits. Join the rest of us out here in the real world. You are so far out of touch it doesn't even count | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:18 PM |

250 responses per page

answered question 142

skipped question 339

13. Comments:

- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 134. Tax the crap out of everybody, and make transit free. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:14 PM |
| 135. Gas tax is the way to fund this. Registration fees are a good idea too but should be tiered higher for those vehicles that cause the most wear and tear. Tax or ban studded tires. Possible have people who use studded tires pay a higher registration fee and have different tags. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:10 PM |
| 136. Oregon cannot afford to tax small businesses too much more. With health insurance on the raise, city, county, trimet, property,saif - these all go up everyyear and should stop. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 2:06 PM |
| 137. autos should be paying for all forms of transportation. | Mon, Sep 28, 2009 3:39 PM |
| 138. Vehicle registration fees, gas taxes, etc. end up targeting the wrong people. Tolls at least target those who benefit from a particular improvement. | Mon, Sep 28, 2009 2:49 PM |
| 139. Street maintenance fees and pricing/tolls make great sense. A gas tax increase makes fiscal sense, but seems like a political non-starter. Investing in strategies that can get beyond the legislature and the referendum process makes the most sense.
I support most fees that raise the price of driving, but those funds should go to maintenance of roads and expansion of transit and bike/ped facilities. | Wed, Sep 23, 2009 8:23 AM |
| 140. We do not come close to capturing the full cost of driving. | Tue, Sep 22, 2009 8:34 PM |
| 141. You already get enough fee and tax funds, look where it is going and take it back from areas that have nothing to do with transportation. NO NEW FEES OR TAXES. I can't believe you are evening making that kind of suggestion. Figure it out, that's why you are in the positions you are. If you need help, give me a call. | Wed, Sep 16, 2009 6:44 PM |
| 142. street maintenance fees might need to be assessed by usage, not proximity to a street - ie- if you are a public transit user/biker, should you have to pay for streets you don't drive your car on? | Tue, Sep 15, 2009 8:05 PM |

250 responses per page

answered question 142

skipped question 339

Appendix I.ii: Online questionnaire results, urban growth report

1. The urban growth report indicates that an expansion of the urban growth boundary will be necessary to accommodate future housing needs unless local governments take actions to make the most efficient use of existing housing opportunities inside the current urban growth boundary to prevent expansion onto farm and forestland. Local actions could include zoning changes, offering development tax credits or using other tools to encourage development in downtowns and along major streets with high quality transit. Do you believe Metro should expand the urban growth boundary to accommodate future housing needs?

	Response Percent	Response Count
yes <input type="checkbox"/>	3.8%	2
no <input type="checkbox"/>	88.5%	46
not sure <input type="checkbox"/>	7.7%	4
answered question		52
skipped question		8

2. If not, which actions should your city or county take to support more housing in your downtown or near major transportation routes?

	Response Count
Hide replies	48
1. Regional growth should affect everyone in the region equally. Currently the system is biased to protect certain communities at the expense of others.	Fri, Oct 16, 2009 3:10 AM
2. I'm not completely apposed to expanding the urban growth boundaries, but not to force people out of their land. Just as an example, my parents built a beautiful home 20 years ago on 4 beautiful acres that has now been zoned multi-dwelling. They built their home in the country in hopes of future generation being able to enjoy the beautiful country views and feeling. Now they know that even if they	Thu, Oct 15, 2009 2:03 PM
50 responses per page	
answered question	
	48
skipped question	
	12

2. If not, which actions should your city or county take to support more housing in your downtown or near major transportation routes?

don't sell their land, if their neighbors do, they'll be looking at apartments rather than the beautiful views. They also know that the beautiful home they built only 20 years ago is now considered a "tear-down". They are not alone in this, their neighbors are in the same situation. And these are beautiful homes with quality floors, cabinets etc. It's very sad to see. There must be a better way to sustain the number of people in this area and keep more of our land open and free, not only for future generations but to keep our air quality cleaner. These big parcels of land is a big part of what's keeping our air quality good. Let's not destroy that too!!

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| <p>3. A QUICK SURVEY OF EVEN WILSONVILLE WILL SHOW THAT THERE IS VERY LITTLE HOUSING FOR LONG STRECHES CLOSELY ASSOCIATED WITH MANY OF THE ALREADY BUILT ROADS AND LIGHT RAIL. FILL THESE AREAS IN. REBUILD OLD AREAS. BUILD UPWARD NOT OUTWARD FOR YEARS TO COME.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 2:02 PM</p> |
| <p>4. We <u>need</u> to keep and increase public space in urban areas, otherwise it is nice warehousing at best.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:16 PM</p> |
| <p>5. There is enough vacant space within the existing boundary to accommodate futre housing. Use what is there rather than expand it.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 9:55 AM</p> |
| <p>6. Redevelop abandoned/foreclosed homes and brownfields.</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:56 AM</p> |
| <p>7. Maintain and guarantee a limited vacancy rate within the city boundaries before allowing additional construction into surrounding areas. Preventing vacancies within urban areas prevents inner urban deterioration as people move out of areas that fall into neglect and degradation.</p> | <p>Wed, Oct 14, 2009 4:35 PM</p> |
| <p>8. Collaborate with other city/counties to ensure future development is contained within the current urban growth boundary and rural reserves are protected.</p> | <p>Wed, Oct 14, 2009 1:44 PM</p> |
| <p>9. Smaller lots, more multi family dwellings, limited new tract housing</p> | <p>Wed, Oct 14, 2009 11:20 AM</p> |
| <p>10. You already have ideas listed above and below this box ... just do them and stop slaughtering prime farm land.</p> | <p>Wed, Oct 14, 2009 6:42 AM</p> |
| <p>11. We need to increase density and efficiency in the use of the urban land we have before we sacrifice more rural land for urban uses. In particular, we need to be mindful of the changing economics of energy and the impact this will have on our transportation system. We must plan for the post-automobile economy.</p> | <p>Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:45 PM</p> |

50 responses per page

answered question 48

skipped question 12

2. If not, which actions should your city or county take to support more housing in your downtown or near major transportation routes?

- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| 12. Continue to look for additional room near transit and good transportation where upzoning and higher densities can be achieved. Continue to invest in street-scape and other human scale amenities such as street trees, sidewalks, bikeways and transit to get more people out of their cars and make more walkable neighborhoods. Increase investments in parks and other public places -- but be creative! We don't need a year-round market like Pike Place -- help the existing and thriving outdoor farmers markets find ways to make year-round operations feasible and attractive to consumers. Sometimes less is more. Continue to support smaller houses with smaller footprints-- clustering, co housing, granny flats, skinny houses and other options should be given assistance from planners/permit folks to overcome barriers to development. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:41 PM |
| 13. More dense housing, infill projects, utilize al the land already in the UGB. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 4:19 PM |
| 14. Zoning changes to allow for increased density | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 12:40 PM |
| 15. only when necessary | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:56 AM |
| 16. We need additional transit service, improved bike and pedestrian facilities targeted on corridors and centers, and increased zoning in these same locations. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:21 AM |
| 17. make better use of land inside the Urban Growth Boundary | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:17 AM |
| 18. There is plenty of land within the Urban Growth Boundaries. The projections for growth are unrealistic. Too many houses have already been built.They are sitting empty. | Tue, Oct 13, 2009 9:58 AM |
| 19. Some of the land that has been designated as farm land is really not farm land. Instead, it is land owned by hobby farmers who are more interested in living in a rural environment than in the commercial production of food. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:00 PM |
| 20. Not everyone wants to live in a pod! | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:36 PM |
| 21. housing and economic development need be addressed inside the current UGB. Identify area's to be developed, promote business ventures. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 11:45 AM |
| 22. I'd like to see old neighborhoods and corridors revitalized instead of building new developments. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:59 AM |
| 23. Provide services, give tax incentives to develop and live in urban areas. | Sun, Oct 11, 2009 5:33 AM |

50 responses per page

answered question 48

skipped question 12

2. If not, which actions should your city or county take to support more housing in your downtown or near major transportation routes?

24. Since its inception, Tri-Met has maintained the fiction that all transportation needs center on downtown Portland, while ignoring other needs. As an example, north to south routes outside of a loosely defined core around Portland are almost non-existent, or where they exist are so infrequent as to be non-usable for the average commuter. The commuter is thus forced to commute to downtown Portland to travel south - or north - wasting huge amounts of time. When Tri-Met has been asked to improve such routes, the response has been that there is no demand. There is no demand because there is no service. No honest effort has been made by Tri-Met to address this issue, leading people to become discouraged with the system, and consequently resorting to the least efficient use of resources, their cars. Sad. :(

Sat, Oct 10, 2009 7:24 PM

25. 1) Household size. The report is based on household size decreasing sharply (less people living in each housing unit). If household size were to remain steady or actually increase, the expansion would not be needed. The economy has already increased household size putting the report that household size will decrease sharply in doubt. In addition area residents need to know the connection between household size and the cost of infrastructure.
 2) Parking lots are a wasteful use of space and in my area (Oregon City) many spaces are empty year around, even at Christmas. There construction reflects a anachronistic car-based culture.
 3) Help the cities learn to move from car-based culture. How about consideration of neighbor-respecting neighborhood jobs and home-based businesses. What work has been done on this?

Sat, Oct 10, 2009 7:53 AM

26. rezoning and incentives

Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:48 AM

27. Housing should be proportionate to available work. Housing should also be a reasonable distance from available work. It is not reasonable to build more housing past Tigard or Gresham for people who want to work in Multnomah county.

Thu, Oct 8, 2009 9:56 PM

28. rezone abandoned commercial/industrial space; encourage/increase density along established mass transit routes

Thu, Oct 8, 2009 11:24 AM

29. I support expanding the urban growth boundary into farmland, but not into forests.

Thu, Oct 8, 2009 9:36 AM

30. Infill. There is a ton and a half of land in surface parking lots, run-down areas, and sprawling single-level buildings that can be redeveloped.

Thu, Oct 8, 2009 8:50 AM

50 responses per page

answered question **48**

skipped question **12**

2. If not, which actions should your city or county take to support more housing in your downtown or near major transportation routes?

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 31. Without a concrete plan for developing infrastructure in UGB expansion areas that already exist and are under or undeveloped, the addition more land is just wasteful speculation driven by the land development community. | Wed, Oct 7, 2009 8:50 PM |
| 32. Build up, not out. Build denser housing near transportation hubs (such as bus or MAX stops). Build on currently empty lots, and remove dilapidated buildings to create space to build better housing. Create incentives for builders not to build "McMansions" that house only one family and waste space for others. | Mon, Oct 5, 2009 3:58 PM |
| 33. Increase zoning in designated centers and near transportation routes. Insure that ped and bike facilities are in place to reduce dependence on vehicles. | Mon, Oct 5, 2009 10:37 AM |
| 34. I would like to see my city redevelop underdeveloped and vacant lands and focus more development along major thoroughfares. I have observed in my neighborhood and adjacent areas, that when more development comes we get more services that are easier to access by foot, bicycle, short car trip, or bus. It improves our quality of life and protects farm and forest land. | Sun, Oct 4, 2009 7:22 PM |
| 35. I think Metro and every other agency should start coming up with strategies to shrink the area, shrink the growth boundary, discourage new growth, and generally work to reduce the amount of people living here. There are numerous ways to do this that could help - no more tax incentives for businesses to move here; make development pay for itself, no more subsidizing development, etc. | Sun, Oct 4, 2009 4:00 PM |
| 36. Changes in zoning to allow smaller lots and multi-unit housing. | Sun, Oct 4, 2009 3:29 PM |
| 37. Residential buildings should be built up near transit, and should be incorporated as mixed-use zoning. Downtown Beaverton and downtown Hillsboro could build up more to accommodate larger numbers of people without requiring a bigger build up of roads. Cheaper housing that is less buildup can be further from transit, but still within a half mile to ensure that walking to a transit hub is possible.
Additionally, with carbon pricing soon to be in play, driving will become even more expensive than it already is. People will begin to do less of it, and the thousands of acres of parking lot within the growth boundary can be used to provide additional areas of growth, without spreading out into existing farmland. | Sun, Oct 4, 2009 9:47 AM |
| 38. Efficient development and zoning departments. I don't know. | Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:25 AM |
| 39. we need more high rises & a subway system. | Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:36 PM |
| 40. See below | Tue, Sep 29, 2009 11:06 PM |

50 responses per page

answered question **48**

skipped question **12**

2. If not, which actions should your city or county take to support more housing in your downtown or near major transportation routes?

41. Greater densities should be imposed on the suburban, post world war two parts of the region. This is much of Washington Co., Clackamas, Co., and East Mult. Co. The urban City of Portland should have significant design controls within the pre WWII urban areas. Mon, Sep 28, 2009 4:01 PM

42. Allow mixed use zoning - residential mixed in with light commercial. Increase urban density, particular in areas near existing public transport. Provide tax incentives to owners/developers who take on projects to help make this happen. Sat, Sep 26, 2009 10:10 AM

43. Except in some very specific localities. There are still areas that could be redeveloped and in rural areas that are already committed to CSA or smaller parcels, Counties could establish slightly lower review standards - e.g. create a new CSA-3 acre zoning. Buy parcels along the Wilsonville commuter rail and jump start community developments Thu, Sep 24, 2009 11:42 AM

44. Increase density and infill. Focus on community based agriculture Wed, Sep 23, 2009 5:30 PM

45. The North Interstate/Yellow Line still has a lot of room for growth. Take advantage of the Eastside streetcar by encouraging higher density housing near MLK/Grand. More projects like the Burnside/Couch couplet to allow inner-city streets to function as both thoroughfares for vehicles and as neighborhood streets. Wed, Sep 23, 2009 8:36 AM

There are many redevelopment opportunities throughout Portland. Pick a street - Lombard, Sandy, Powell - all could be re-imagined to accommodate more people and less vehicles.

46. Continue infill efforts and use available underused areas to support more housing. Thu, Sep 17, 2009 5:44 PM

47. You got plenty of room use it wisely. See your next question. Wed, Sep 16, 2009 6:47 PM

48. All options available. We need dense, liveable communities, not sprawl! Please save what everyone that has grown up here cherishes and what everyone that has moved here loves: open space, farm land and restricted growth. Tue, Sep 15, 2009 7:22 PM

50 responses per page

answered question **48**

skipped question **12**

3. The urban growth report indicates that most of the region's new jobs over the next 20 years can be accommodated on vacant land and underutilized sites within the current urban growth boundary through a variety of actions Metro and your local government can take to support more jobs in existing downtowns and employment areas. Rate the following actions that could be considered as part of this strategy.

	strongly consider	consider	do not consider	Response Count
clean up brownfield sites	79.2% (42)	18.9% (10)	1.9% (1)	53
reuse abandoned buildings	96.2% (51)	3.8% (2)	0.0% (0)	53
target public investments (such as urban renewal and tax incentives)	52.8% (28)	43.4% (23)	3.8% (2)	53
expand the urban growth boundary	3.8% (2)	20.8% (11)	75.5% (40)	53
			answered question	53
			skipped question	7

4. As noted in the urban growth report, many renters in our region are defined as “cost-burdened”; that is, they spend more than 50 percent of their household income on housing and transportation costs. In downtowns and along main streets where housing may be more expensive, renters often rely on transit, walking or biking to keep their living expenses manageable. In some areas where housing is less expensive, renters are often further from their jobs and quality transit service, which increases their transportation costs. Which strategy should Metro and local governments focus on to reduce the number of cost-burdened households in the region?

		Response Percent	Response Count
invest in housing choices near high quality transit	<input type="text" value="21.2%"/>	21.2%	11
invest in high quality transit in areas with more affordable housing	<input type="text" value="7.7%"/>	7.7%	4
both	<input type="text" value="65.4%"/>	65.4%	34
neither	<input type="text" value="5.8%"/>	5.8%	3
		answered question	52
		skipped question	8

5. Comments:

Response Count

5. Comments:

 [Hide replies](#)

25

1. I honestly believe when spread across the population, people make housing and employment choices independent of each other. They live where they want to live. They work where they want to work. They chose the 'easiest' transportation between the two they can afford. The balance will always favor the single person automobile until it is priced out of the equation. And since we don't have 24-hour transit, what do people do who work outside those hours? They drive.

Fri, Oct 16, 2009 3:10 AM

2. This is a tough question. Living near high quality transit is wonderful, but along with it came more crime. I hope your definition of affordable housing is not "low income housing". This too has brought more crime into our area.

Thu, Oct 15, 2009 2:03 PM

3. Watch out for development that creates a pressure wave that displaces the lower income folks currently living in the area.

Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:16 PM

4. Those individuals that can't afford where they live should consider moving to a new location. The taxpayer shouldn't be forced to pay for the housing or the transportation for "cost burdened" households. After all, don't we ALL fit into that catagory?

Wed, Oct 14, 2009 4:35 PM

5. Affordable housing residents need transportation options for employment and services. Placement of housing near transit options and providing such options where they do not currently exist, is critical to maintaining equity and quality of life for all.

Wed, Oct 14, 2009 1:44 PM

6. I think we will see falling rents over the next five years. I think the Pearl and South Water Front districts are over built for the price points the developers were seeking. A number of these projects will be come middle income rental properties. The vacant space in the South Water Front district should be used for additional lower-middle income rental properties.

Wed, Oct 14, 2009 11:20 AM

7. with the priority on housing near existing transit

Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:31 AM

8. We need to correct the false economy of making living beyond the reach of transportation infrastructure appear cheaper. As fuel prices increase the fallacy of cheap suburban housing will become clear. We need affordable housing in areas well served by transit.

Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:45 PM

9. Don't forget about walking and biking facilities -- not just transit. We could build a fantastic bike/walk network in this city with a fraction of the funding used to build streetcar and lightrail lines. Find ways to do it! Projects like the NPDX

Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:41 PM

50 responses per page

answered question 25

skipped question 35

5. Comments:

GreenWay and Sullivan's Gulch Trail (let alone those last gaps in the Willamette River Greenway -- been underneath the Marquam Bridge lately? -- and the Springwater Trail) should be made higher priorities and finished! Let's get serious about these alternatives that help make longer trips feasible. Make it SAFER to bike in our city -- keep up the work on projects like the bike boxes, dedicated bike lanes, bike routes and other investments.

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| <p>10. We need to continue expanding our public transit and biking system to accommodate areas outside the core; meanwhile, we also need to make incentives for low income housing within the core</p> | <p>Tue, Oct 13, 2009 12:40 PM</p> |
| <p>11. Regarding the industrial lands, please please please consider utilizing urban renewal to assemble lands in specific, targeted outdated industrial areas to create more appropriate conditions for new industrial uses. Regarding cost-burdened housing, greater HCT and other transit along with the concentration on centers and corridors will help ease this issue.</p> | <p>Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:21 AM</p> |
| <p>12. I believe a lot of money has been wasted on projects such as WES and bike facilities that really do not effective as commuter facilities.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:00 PM</p> |
| <p>13. However, better bus service rather than more rail would better serve many communities</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:36 PM</p> |
| <p>14. Metro could also look at encouraging higher wage jobs out where housing is less expensive to reduce the need for high quality transit and cost-burdened households.</p> | <p>Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:59 AM</p> |
| <p>15. 1) Our region does not need more stranded investments of further car-based transportation when both climate change and peak oil demand we move past carbon-dioxide emissions from fossil fuels.
2) The report did not determine how urban residents will be feed or what their foodshed needs are. Shouldn't local food be available if hauling distant food becomes progressively less available?</p> | <p>Sat, Oct 10, 2009 7:53 AM</p> |
| <p>16. Not clear what you are asking</p> | <p>Thu, Oct 8, 2009 8:50 AM</p> |
| <p>17. There are two classes of transit riders, those who elect to use transit over using an automobile, and those who don't any other choice. Focus on the economically disadvantages; improved transit options will create additional employment opportunities for them. The economically advantaged will always be able to adapt to their transit and multi-modal commuting options.</p> | <p>Wed, Oct 7, 2009 8:50 PM</p> |

50 responses per page

answered question **25**

skipped question **35**

5. Comments:

18. We need to do both. It is very difficult to develop affordable housing, but we need to keep working on that in areas with high quality transit that are close to jobs and other services. We also need to serve people who are living in affordable housing and not well served by transit. Sun, Oct 4, 2009 7:22 PM

19. Encouraging higher quality transit which citizens can and will use every day will improve the ridership numbers and revenues and allow Trimet to provide growth to outlying areas. Sun, Oct 4, 2009 9:47 AM

20. we need housing which is built close to mass transit stations. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:36 PM

21. Transit should not be based on cost burdened households. Affordable is very problematic. Affordable housing cannot be built without government subsidy. What we need are higher wage jobs and other strategies that will improve the income of those earning the lowest wages. We also need more developers building lower cost housing while maintaining good design quality and appearance. Mon, Sep 28, 2009 4:01 PM

22. I think the concept of the urban growth boundary must be held constant, and not simply expand the boundaries as growth pressures rise. We need rural buffer zones between urban areas, with good transit options to get from one urban center to another. Sat, Sep 26, 2009 10:10 AM

23. good question....and will vary with the area...both strategies have their place...a good example would be a Clackamas TC- Milwaukie Connector transit route..so far Metro has done pretty well Thu, Sep 24, 2009 11:42 AM

24. Affordable housing in inner areas and better transit in more suburban areas are both needed. Now, what to do about Clark County... Wed, Sep 23, 2009 8:36 AM

25. People need to be left alone to make choices where they live and then hold them accountable. Wed, Sep 16, 2009 6:47 PM

50 responses per page

answered question **25**

skipped question **35**

Appendix I.iii: Online questionnaire results, urban and rural reserves

Page: Lands for farms, employment and housing

1. Urban growth decisions require that we either protect farm and forestland and accommodate more people on less land or sacrifice farm and forestland for more individual elbow room. On a scale of 1 to 5, should the region (1) protect farmland at all cost with a tight urban growth boundary or (5) allow urban expansion into farmland to encourage substantial tracts of new low density housing development?

		Response Percent	Response Count
1 protect farmland at all cost with a tight urban growth boundary and small urban reserves	<input type="checkbox"/>	68.1%	128
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	23.4%	44
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	4.3%	8
4	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.6%	3
5 create larger urban reserves and continue suburban style development	<input type="checkbox"/>	2.7%	5
answered question			188
skipped question			16

2. The view so far into the future is inherently in soft focus and imprecise. However, Metro has calculated low and high estimates for the land needed to accommodate expected population and jobs over the next 40 to 50 years. Within that range, should the region aim to set aside (1) more land for urban reserves to make sure we don't run short for housing and jobs or (5) less land for urban reserves to spur investment in our current downtowns and to conserve more farms, forests and natural areas?

		Response Percent	Response Count
1 more land for urban reserves	<input type="checkbox"/>	5.3%	10
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	2.1%	4
answered question			189
skipped question			15

2. The view so far into the future is inherently in soft focus and imprecise. However, Metro has calculated low and high estimates for the land needed to accommodate expected population and jobs over the next 40 to 50 years. Within that range, should the region aim to set aside (1) more land for urban reserves to make sure we don't run short for housing and jobs or (5) less land for urban reserves to spur investment in our current downtowns and to conserve more farms, forests and natural areas?

3	<input type="checkbox"/>	5.3%	10
4	<input type="checkbox"/>	18.5%	35
5 less land for urban reserves	<input type="checkbox"/>	68.8%	130
answered question			189
skipped question			15

3. Washington County has proposed urban reserves that are significantly larger than Clackamas and Multnomah counties, in large part so that they will continue to attract industries and the jobs they provide. As we craft the system of reserves for the entire metropolitan area, should we support this approach of building on one county's success or attempt to balance employment across all three counties?

		Response Percent	Response Count
support greater economic growth in Washington County	<input type="checkbox"/>	11.4%	21
balance employment across the region	<input type="checkbox"/>	88.6%	164
answered question			185
skipped question			19

4. Comments:

	Response Count
 Hide replies	91
answered question	91
skipped question	113

4. Comments:

1. Washington County just wants cheap land for corporate give-aways. Additionally, Washington County is unwilling to support increased public transit investment. They are just hoping they get enough manufacturing out here that they can somehow force the Region to build more freeways. Personally, I think all 3 metro counties should be consolidated into one county governed by METRO.

Fri, Oct 16, 2009 3:01 AM

2. Washington County has lost half of its farmland to urban growth since 1950. That is more than enough.

Thu, Oct 15, 2009 8:55 PM

3. I choose this option because there were no others. I do not support building industry on some of the most perfect agricultural land in the nation. How will we feed ourselves if our productive lands are built upon???? Please look for better answers.

Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:25 PM

4. I have a piece of land that is at 19657 McCord Rd in Oregon City and a second tax lot to the parcel that is adjacent to the southwest. It is two tax lots. One tax lot is inside the UGB and the other tax lot is Outside the UGB. The lot outside the UGB is mainly flat grass and is 3 acres. It is zoned timber. There are maybe 5 trees on the 3 acres. I spoke to Tim O'Brien about this property several times in the past couple of years and he said it would be a good candidate to be brought into the UGB. I realize this is a small piece, but it makes sense to bring this tax lot into the UGB. Part of my property is inside and part of my property is outside, the UGB. There is currently a 90 home subdivision that is being built by Icon Construction that is about 50 yards from this property line. All things considered, I would like this property to be included in this round of additional space for the new UGB. i can be reached at 503-939-3830 or mark@heffins.com. Thank you, Mark Herring

Thu, Oct 15, 2009 2:50 PM

5. We don not need more urban sprawl to attract jobs. The only people benefiting are the developers pushing the plan. We are ruining our beautiful state to line a few pockets with more money.

Thu, Oct 15, 2009 6:34 AM

6. While the majority of development is currently in Multnomah County I see no reason for sprawl and expansion Westward. Though the WES is a great improvement public transit access and sustainability is already struggling there--we shouldn't further exacerbate the problem.

Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:48 AM

7. We have lots of land available for development or redevelopment within the existing urban growth boundary. Many of these parcels would be much more attractive to developers with relatively minor investment to upgrade existing streets and other urban infrastructure. The Lents and Gateway areas in east

Thu, Oct 15, 2009 12:30 AM

100 responses per page

answered question 91

skipped question 113

4. Comments:

Portland are prime examples -- also the Cully Neighborhood near the Airport. I'm sure there are similar areas in the other cities and in all three counties.

-
8. Growth isn't limited to industry. the jobs are negated by the increase in population. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 8:01 PM
-
9. While Washington County claims that it is projected to have the largest increase in population, that should not indicate a need for setting aside vast amounts of land for urban reserves. One of many reasons that Washington County should better manage the density of housing is so new business have room to bring new jobs and at the same time, avoid threatening our valuable farmland that is very unique to the Portland Area, most of which is located in Washington County. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 4:14 PM
-
10. I think it's important to encourage what is often termed "smart growth" whereby growth occurs but instead of continuing to build more houses on more land, using up farmland to build suburbs, people are encourage to live in the city and in higher density housing. Therefore, I don't believe that greater urban reserves are necessarily integral to creating and retaining jobs in the community, and thus believe that we do not need to support greater urban reserves such are seen in Washington County. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 2:48 PM
-
11. It's not great for the region but you can't always channel market forces exactly where you want them - employers looking for the kind of sites available in Washington County may be more likely to look in another state than to select a site in another part of the region that doesn't have the same type of advantages that Washington County provides. As long as employment grows in Washington County it shifts the focal point of the region west, though, which may undermine regional planning. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 12:41 PM
-
12. because of traffic. also keeps balanced federal money in each county Wed, Oct 14, 2009 11:33 AM
-
13. It does not seem necessary to me to allow industrial sprawl in order to attract industries. How can Washington County increase its capacity for business by increasing density? Wed, Oct 14, 2009 11:30 AM
-
14. Too much of Washington county's employment growth has come from out of state companies locating facilities in the county. These company's do not actively support local schools or cultural programs in any important way, as the companies do these things in the cities where they have headquarter offices. We should increase employment by creating incentives for locally owned businesses to grow. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 11:28 AM

100 responses per page

answered question 91

skipped question 113

4. Comments:

15. As a Washington County resident, I can attest to the county's faulty claims for land needs for business purposes. Looking at the extant buildings, they model sprawl. There are large vacant lots, single-story office buildings that sit empty or, if inhabited, are poorly situated to accomodate public transit. More development of the kind already demonstrated is unlikely to produce significant economic gain and definitely will not create better communities. Furthermore, attempting to concentrate industry in one county will serve to increase transporation woes as it will force people to live in other parts of the region but then commute to Washington County for work. Driving from Gresham to Hillsboro, for instance, would be a nightmare and would clog our highways even more.

Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:28 AM

16. I'm against adding any urban reserves when we have available land inside existing UGB, which we do. It is foolish to doom ourselves to importing food from farther and farther away because the productive farmland is now industrial or residential. Then everyone pays more and more for food that supports business elsewhere, and more of our food dollars go toward transportation rather than healthy food.

Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:20 AM

17. The urban growth report says that most development needed in the foreseeable future can be accomodated within the current urban growth boundaries, so I see no justifiable reason for any significant increase in the urban reserve for Washington county.

Wed, Oct 14, 2009 6:54 AM

However, there is much talk about the reserve expansion's actual purpose, which is to punch the connector highway through prime, high value farm land (currently outside the UGB) ... and to do it mostly behind closed doors without public comment. I find it disgraceful that our public officials would not only ignore overwhelming public outcry to such action (on earlier public comments to the 6 options), but then lie about why they are making changes to the urban preserve to fool the public into not complaining about how they are circumventing state law.

18. This should not be an either/or choice. We should help support greater economic growth in WA/CO -- we need those jobs!!!! But don't forget the rest of the region -- we need to find some balance so that people can find work where they want to live and live near where they work.

Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:44 PM

19. In order to encourage less commuting and allow people to work and shop locally it would be prudent to have employment opportunities throughout the Metro region along with space for agriculture. Providing rapid transit versus more roads will help reduce our carbon footprint and is kinder to the agricultural and

Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:35 PM

100 responses per page

answered question 91

skipped question 113

4. Comments:

rural communities by requiring less land development.

-
20. Washington County comprises some of the most fertile grown in the area. We should be protecting that ground for farming and identify land not suitable for farming and encourage growth in those areas. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 5:50 PM
-
21. We do not have the water available in Washington county to sustain agriculture, forests and the people who are already here. Where is the water going to come from if you allow rampant development and other industries that use massive amounts of water? How can the fish recover if the humans are hogging all the water? Tue, Oct 13, 2009 4:55 PM
-
22. Hold the UGB to prevent urban sprawl. Spend more \$ for urban redevelopment and densification. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 1:52 PM
-
23. NO expansion of current urban growth boundary Tue, Oct 13, 2009 1:09 PM
-
24. Balancing employment does not necessitate having more urban reserves. Prove that Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:49 AM
-
25. I am writing to respond to the document "Urban and rural reserves recommendation" available at the web site:
<http://www.oregonmetro.gov/index.cfm/go/by.web/id=31389> Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:44 AM

I am a resident of Clackamas County. I reside at:
29477 SW Ladd Hill Rd.
Sherwood, Oregon 97140

I am responding specifically to the recommendations on the "South Sherwood/West Wilsonville Area" [pages 12 -- 14; Appendix 3E-A -- Rserve Area Assessments and Recommendations].

I am writing to:

1. oppose the expansion of the urban reserve area to include the agricultural land immediately south of Sherwood in Clackamas county,
2. endorse the modest proposal for designating rural reserves in the document, and
3. recommend expansion of the rural reserve recommendation to include the land immediately south of the Pleasant Hill/McConell/Morgan Rd corridor. This will provide explicit connection to the Tonquin basin rural reserve area.

I dispute the finding in suitability note (a) [Appendix 3E-A; page 12] that this area

100 responses per page

answered question 91

skipped question 113

4. Comments:

is suitable for future urbanization.

I concur with the implicit finding in note (a) that transportation services in the area are inadequate to support urban expansion.

I believe that the concerns raised in suitability note (c) about the creation of an island of rural land strongly suggest that a corridor of rural land connecting the rural reserve of the Tonquin basin to the rural reserves of the Parrett Mountain agricultural area be established. The treatment I propose in (3) is more consistent with Metro's policy than the proposed treatment.

I dispute the finding in suitability note (e) that there is not an obvious natural boundary dividing urban and rural uses. The current UGB largely follows the ridge-line separating Sherwood from the watershed I described. This is a natural boundary separating rural and urban than can and should be preserved.

I am alarmed to see reference to the failed I-5 to 99W planning process in this document. The failure of Washington and Clackamas county elected officials to reach an acceptable consensus resulted in a "split decision" of a process that was initiated as seeking a consensus. I participated in that process. I provided feedback. It failed to produce proposal acceptable to the residents of the region and to our elected representatives. I do not think it is appropriate to include the outcome of that process as a recommendation in the metro planning document.

-
26. I find the Urban Reserves land requests submitted by Washington County to be far too large. In particular, I am opposed to most if not all of the lands located south of TV Highway and west of the existing boundaries of Aloha/Beaverton and Tigard being included in any future development. To consider the lands along Tile Flat Road, Clark Hill Road, and other areas near to Scholls as sub-prime agricultural land to be built on is to be stuck in a 20th century developer time-warp. I am not familiar enough with the other areas that the county has requested to be included as urban reserves, but if they are in any way similar to this section, then I suggest that the county has overreached itself in an attempt to get as many marbles as they can. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:15 AM
-
27. What really matters is the suitability of the land for its purpose. Not counties competing for industry. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 9:33 AM
-
28. The urban/rural relationship is out of balance. The more we focus on the mfg jobs that are not coming to Oregon for a variety of reasons (a punitive tax system for one, onerous workplace regulations for two), the closer we come to not being sustainable. We cannot continue to outsource our food production, we Tue, Oct 13, 2009 7:59 AM

100 responses per page

answered question 91

skipped question 113

4. Comments:

must bring back food production within a few miles of the food consumption. Reliance upon others to produce and provide our food is shortsighted and dangerous.

-
29. Some of the areas that have been designated farm land is really not farm land. The end result is that we end up protecting "hobby farmers" who are primarily interested in living in a rural environment. This group does not contribute to the food production process that we normally associate with the business of farming. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:46 PM
-
30. Much of the so-called farmland being proposed is not really farmable land Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:29 PM
-
31. Balancing employment across the region will allow individuals to live closer to the work. This will help limit transportation congestion problems and environmental impacts of long commutes. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 1:15 PM
-
32. County costs to citizens for infrastructure should not be primarily Wash Co. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 11:40 AM
-
33. I would like to see employment land in Sherwood for higher paying jobs. Not retail or other low wage business. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:39 AM
-
34. To the extent that there is a balance between housing availability, jobs, and transportation infrastructure in place they should be balanced. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:10 AM
-
35. Historically, Washington County has done a poor job in planning for growth. It needs the constraints to ensure more innovative approaches to development. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 8:31 AM
-
36. This affects transportation needs significantly as id does already. If people could live affordably closer to their workplaces it would impact commute time and issues. Sun, Oct 11, 2009 5:27 AM
-
37. I would be more inclined to concentrate employment/development in counties that have a track record of urban density. Allowing one county to have larger reserves then others fosters competition between jurisdictions when a regional outlook is more appropriate to the scale of employment opportunities and challenges. Sat, Oct 10, 2009 11:45 AM
-
38. put the industrial land wherever it makes the most sense, do not create articial blaancing. Next we can move to share property taxes acriss the region so we wont care where the employer locates so long as they invest in our region and hire from our region. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:45 AM
-
39. I don't know enough about market behavior versus what existing communities need to answer this next question. If a community has a need for farm land - doesn't that also mean that community is part of the market? I don't think these Fri, Oct 9, 2009 9:28 AM

100 responses per page

answered question 91

skipped question 113

4. Comments:

have to be mutually exclusive

-
40. Consistency and balance across the region is the key to our approach. Metro must demonstrate a commitment to regional governance--even across state boundaries. Disproportionate growth in one area could potentially stifle investment in other areas, undermining the goal of the regional approach altogether. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 9:05 AM
-
41. Washington county has some great opportunities for farmlands. It makes me sad to see cookie cutter house communities dropped on fertile soil. Thu, Oct 8, 2009 9:45 PM
-
42. Washington County includes irreplaceable farmland and greenspace that should be preserved. Thu, Oct 8, 2009 11:28 AM
-
43. I support using farmland for urban growth, but not forest land. Thu, Oct 8, 2009 9:51 AM
-
44. How about shrink the UGB? Thu, Oct 8, 2009 8:43 AM
-
45. The region must also be defined to include Yamhill, Columbia, and Clark counties, not just the three within Metro's service territory. Wed, Oct 7, 2009 8:31 PM
-
46. This is a tough one, but since Metro will continue to control UGB expansions, it can set the pace in Washington County and require reasonable infill before expanding into the reserves. Wed, Oct 7, 2009 11:13 AM
-
47. Metro needs to consider that each city needs to have a tax base that can cover the cost of services, and in Oregon that means having industrial and commercial property within YOUR city. This reality runs against the concept of Metro as one unit, which requires that Metro adopt a flexible policy towards cities, such as Forest Grove and Cornelius, both of which are an island. These cities need to grow to be self-sustaining and thus reach the long term sustainability goals of Metro. Tue, Oct 6, 2009 12:45 PM
-
48. Washington County has plenty of land (as well as dilapidated areas ripe for redevelopment) already in existence within the UGB. It is time to use the existing resources, building up rather than out, to meet the future needs of our community. Once a farm, forest, or rural land is paved over, you can never go back; it is vital to protect farms and rural areas now and into the future to preserve the integrity and value of our community. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 3:26 PM
-
49. Metro should work with Washington County to help them utilize more effectively the land they have that is within the UGB. When I am in Washington Co., I see lots of underutilized and vacant land. That should be used before we pave over valuable farm and forest land. Sun, Oct 4, 2009 7:09 PM

100 responses per page

answered question 91

skipped question 113

4. Comments:

Further, it makes sense to try to locate jobs where people already live so we can cut down on travel time to work.

-
50. In the long term, growth has to be up and not out. 1) Mass transit works only in dense environments. 2) when gas is \$10 per gallon (maybe not too far off) driving from a suburb will not be cost effective 3) farm land will be in short supply when global warming ruins many places, and we'll need all the farm land we can get. Only developers benefit from urban sprawl by using easy to develop land and letting the public worry about the infrastructure. Make them work a little harder for their money by reclaiming old and worn out sections of the city, instead of the easy path of paving over farm land. Let's get real about the future and eliminate any further expansion of our urban boundaries. Sun, Oct 4, 2009 3:27 PM
-
51. Great farmland is never recovered once it is designated for urban development. Farmland resources cannot protect itself from greedy short term profit oriented developers. That is the job of the state government and Metro. I moved here 12 years ago because of Metro. It's a livability issue. Metro's ability to control sprawl and pollution is a huge asset to the Portland area. Sat, Oct 3, 2009 10:52 AM
-
52. This seems obvious. Perhaps I am missing something. Why should any county get more? Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:21 AM
-
53. We need very very tight urban boundaries for all 3 counties. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:31 PM
-
54. THE HELVETIA AREA NORTH OF HW 26 SHOULD BE IN RURAL RESERVES NOT URBAN RESERVES. DON'T BE STUPID AND CREATE ANOTHER SAN JOSE / SANTA CLARA. IF YOU INCLUDE THE HELVETIA AREA IN THE URBAN RESERVES THIS WILL BE JUST ANOTHER MEGALOPOLIS AND CERTAINLY NOT A "GREATEST PLACE". THINK QUALITY OF LIFE NOT MORE MONEY FOR DEVELOPERS. Wed, Sep 30, 2009 5:48 PM
-
55. washington County is very attractive to families and so we the people must ruin it for the people...We like it here because we have enough room to garden and for the grandkids to run around in, have some animals and the sunset is beautiful...Why can't we have the space? Tue, Sep 29, 2009 5:32 AM
-
56. Washington county has some of the best farm land in the U.S. As much of this farmland should be protected as possible for as long as possible. The next twenty-five years will be very different than the last 25. We don't want to change and grow too fast. Mon, Sep 28, 2009 3:47 PM
-
57. This expansion appears to be a land grab for Hillsboro and North Plains. We live in Helvetia specifically so as to not live in an urban environment! Choice must be available. Mon, Sep 28, 2009 10:10 AM
-

100 responses per page

answered question 91

skipped question 113

4. Comments:

58. You should assume the county recommendations represent an appropriate plan from their perspective Mon, Sep 28, 2009 7:03 AM
-
59. Ideally I'd like to see employment balanced, however it may be appropriate for some areas to pursue certain kinds of industries that require land, while other areas may be able to infill existing urban centers. I think the goal should be for people to be able to live near their work whenever possible.
I believe the rural reserves should be essentially permanent - to provide isolation between urban centers. All kinds of public transport should connect urban centers - roads, light rail, bike trails, walking paths, etc. Sat, Sep 26, 2009 10:04 AM
-
60. Your first question is beyond biased towards answering to save farmland. We can increase urban reserves while planning with smart growth strategies, encouraging strong centers and developing a strong infrastructure that will support high capacity transit, strong trade routes to and from our ports and balanced employment. I'm shocked at this survey. Quite frankly, I'm disappointed and embarrassed. Fri, Sep 25, 2009 7:30 PM
-
61. If all the jobs are in Washington County, our transportation and land use developments will grow even further out of balance. There has to be a way to continue to attract industries to Washington County without sacrificing some of the best agricultural lands in the country. Wed, Sep 23, 2009 8:27 AM
-
62. We need to stop suburban style communities of culdesacs, strip malls, drive only, shopping malls, etc., and instead support 20 minutes communities where families can walk in 20 minutes or less to get their needs met: groceries, health care, farmers markets, post office, school, jobs, parks, libraries, etc. Tue, Sep 22, 2009 6:21 PM
-
63. Multnomah county needs to include more urban reserves. In west multnomah, my property of 62 acres, us ubuts the North Bethany Expansion, above is Portland city limits and west will be washington urban reserves...I will be surrounded by development, but have been recently designated as rural by Multnomah co...this is not logical. Why would this area not be brought into urban? I feel Multnomah factors are wrong and the CAC reserves process was not an open or a fair process. I attended these meetings, not missing one, for the past 10+ months. My property is located: lower 24 is on the east side of Kaiser road and south of Germantown. The upper 37 is north of Germantown. This is not farm land, but had been miss-zoned back in the mid 70's. Multnomah needs to add and balance out their urban designations and help save real (important) farm land in washington co! Tue, Sep 22, 2009 10:07 AM
-
64. I believe it's up to each individual county to provide and support employment within it's realm Mon, Sep 21, 2009 5:44 PM

100 responses per page

answered question 91

skipped question 113

4. Comments:

65. No only should all counties benefit from regional growth and development, but one county should not be able to remove thousands of acres of prime, productive and significant farm and recreation land from the map. Mon, Sep 21, 2009 9:46 AM

66. Decisions made by "Core 4" will affect the entire region. The hearings in Clackamas County DO NOT reflect the desires of those who live outside Metro, but will affect them for the next 50 years! We cannot provide the necessary employment and development land we need without municipal autonomy for cities outside Metro! Sun, Sep 20, 2009 9:54 PM

67. People need to be able to work near where they live, or have easily accessible and efficient public transportation to reach their workplace Sun, Sep 20, 2009 6:58 PM

68. Some of the best farmland is in Washington County. Food security issues would dictate that we not develop that land willy nilly. Sun, Sep 20, 2009 9:04 AM

69. Measures I recommend and am prepared to facilitate: Sun, Sep 20, 2009 7:33 AM
TIFF Funding should be pegged to accomplish MULTIPLE public goals, not just serve multi-family builders:
Expand Urban Renewal Districts STATEWIDE - and increase walkable/bike-able density potential - along major streets and existing Highways, particularly areas in need of re-development and safety improvements for family-friendliness, ADA improvements, and new Jobs, notably Lombard, Killingsworth Streets, Sandy Blvd, Powell, 122nd.

Incentivize new Mixed Use Districts:
Adjust some zoning served by Transit and major street connectors) from Residential to Mixed use, including 102nd avenue,

Increase density activity among private homeowners with under-used available space. Do this by: Amending State Property Tax law to cease penalties for taking permits, and balance Tax Rates by Income/Ability to pay. Create a Renovation Loan Fund (with wider access to low-income Home-Owners) and allow it to be re-paid by Consent Lien, with target sale date stated in the agreement. Offer Assistance for quality Models and access to expert architects, green materials, and builders. Include GREEN MEASURES in the funding opportunity, including conservation Solar and geo-term measures, small wind, food-production, and rain-water harvesting for on-site use. Facilitate Co-Housing Planning and re-development that support goals of aging adults and families in walking distance to existing schools.

100 responses per page

answered question **91**

skipped question **113**

4. Comments:

70. These natural reserves and farmland are a part of the green economy of tomorrow. Most advocates of sprawl are trapped in a 20th Century mentality. Urban density will increase public transit efficiency. If Metro holds tight on sprawl, perhaps some of the land reclaimed can be roads. Sun, Sep 20, 2009 6:29 AM
-
71. While we need to preserve the large sections of farms and rural areas, it's also important to bring jobs to Oregon so we have the funds (tax base) to afford more parks and preserves. Sun, Sep 20, 2009 6:06 AM
-
72. Be certain of this--we stand at the crossroads of history. Do we want our lovely land to be turned into an unregulated urban cesspool like Houston, Texas? Those who would destroy our countryside in the pursuit of profit do not care one whit for their fellow citizens' health and welfare. Density works--nothing else does! Sun, Sep 20, 2009 4:28 AM
-
73. These counties should not be in competition with one another for jobs, housing, farm and forest reserves, recreational areas, parks and green spaces nor for property tax dollars. All metropolitan counties and cities should be working in concert with one another for equality of each and all of these limited resources as well as providing for our citizens. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 6:30 PM
-
74. There is already substantial developed industrial property that is vacant/unused. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 6:22 PM
-
75. Washington County has some of the region's highest quality farmland. This valuable resource has potential to increase our region's self-sufficiency in terms of local food production and should not be compromised to urbanization, which is more appropriate on less fertile land. Ideally, land productivity should be a major factor in determining which areas become designated as urban reserves. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 5:08 PM
-
76. Placing more urban reserves in one area (rather than dispersing them evenly) could also mean a greater risk for the area with a higher concentration of reserves economically. If land is left for industries, but companies don't move in, the county could lose more money than if they restricted land and were more careful about selecting industries. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 4:10 PM
-
77. These questions are somewhat leading... Kind of in an honest way, though. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 3:56 PM
-
78. with a concentration on green jobs Sat, Sep 19, 2009 3:53 PM
-
79. Besides available build-able land, tax structures and infrastructures are important industry considerations. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 2:00 PM
-
80. My answer should be clarified to say that I do not support expanding the urban growth boundary in Clackamas or Multnomah counties. I think the only option Sat, Sep 19, 2009 8:44 AM

100 responses per page

answered question 91

skipped question 113

4. Comments:

should be for Washington County to propose a more reasonable approach. If we allow Washington County to hold higher reserves, we are in effect saying that it is fine to continue the sprawl as long as it is in Washington county. It is not fine. Anyone who has visited there lately can see that there is a lot of space inside the growth boundary that is not effectively used.

81. We don't have the water to support Washington County's growth aspirations unless we build a hugely expensive dam, drink from the Willamette or kill our lawns. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 8:37 AM

82. I moved to Beaverton to be close to my work and because I couldn't afford a house in Portland/MultCo. If we balance the employment, housing will stay more affordable across the tri-county area, instead of just the rural parts of the counties. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 1:28 AM

83. Working farms on foundation farmland is the land that Washington County wants to bring into its urban reserve. Use the tools the legislature gave to protect this farmland from growth, rather than making way for development when Metro's COO report shows it is not needed. Jobs can adequately be located within our existing UGB. Those who move to the area want walkable communities, not low-density development. Thu, Sep 17, 2009 1:11 PM

84. No new housing is needed, and please keep the UGB as it is, and keeping farmland. Thu, Sep 17, 2009 11:47 AM

85. Leave the Farmland alone, because asphalt and concrete do not raise crops! By the looks of all of the empty business, and property, NO NEW LAND IS NEEDED FOR ANY BUILDING. Thu, Sep 17, 2009 11:30 AM

86. There is still active and productive farmland in the proposed urban reserves area in Washington county that is a tremendous asset for buying fresh, local produce. There is a lot of infill development that can be done and a lot of corridors where more dense development can happen. We should build up and not out as much as possible and create all sorts of jobs within twenty minutes bike/transit/walk of all neighborhoods in the metro area. Thu, Sep 17, 2009 9:08 AM

87. Irresponsible decision makers often throw out the term "job creation" as a way of hiding the irresponsible decision. Jobs can be created by creating higher density within the current boundary. As well business have plenty of empty space within our current areas. MLK blvd has many empty lots and buildings. Why leave those to further dilapidated at the cost of forest & farm land. Thu, Sep 17, 2009 6:18 AM

88. That question is worded poorly. Thu, Sep 17, 2009 6:17 AM

100 responses per page

answered question 91

skipped question 113

4. Comments:

89. Economic growth in Washington County is not inherently tied to larger urban reserves. We can enhance the county's economic growth by supporting its farmers, foresters, and others who steward the natural resources. Thu, Sep 17, 2009 6:04 AM

90. While I chose "balance employment across the region," I believe either solution can work. Transportation issues become more important if the economic development is concentrated in one area. However, there are economies of scale that can be realized. Thu, Sep 17, 2009 4:47 AM

91. Kick Washington County out of Metro. Problem solved. Wed, Sep 16, 2009 6:49 PM

100 responses per page

answered question **91**

skipped question **113**

5. The shape and placement of urban and rural reserves can enhance and complete existing communities or be purely market driven. On a scale of 1 to 5, should the urban reserves (1) be located and designed specifically to improve existing communities or (5) be more broadly defined so the market determines how they develop over time?

		Response Percent	Response Count
1 be located and designed specifically to improve existing communities	<input type="text" value="54.1%"/>	54.1%	100
2	<input type="text" value="18.9%"/>	18.9%	35
3	<input type="text" value="13.5%"/>	13.5%	25
4	<input type="text" value="3.2%"/>	3.2%	6
5 be more broadly defined so the market determines how they develop over time	<input type="text" value="10.3%"/>	10.3%	19
		<i>answered question</i>	185
		<i>skipped question</i>	19

6. Roads, water and sewer pipes and parks are essential elements of a great community and all cost money. On a scale of 1 to 5, should the region focus investments on roads, pipes and parks (1) in existing communities or (5) in new developments as land is added to the urban growth boundary?

		Response Percent	Response Count
1 in existing communities	<input type="checkbox"/>	62.9%	117
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	18.3%	34
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	12.9%	24
4	<input type="checkbox"/>	2.2%	4
5 in new developments as land is added to the urban growth boundary	<input type="checkbox"/>	3.8%	7
answered question			186
skipped question			18

7. Who should pay for the roads, sewer systems, drinking water systems and parks for new development?

		Response Percent	Response Count
developers – the people who build and sell the new housing developments (costs are usually passed on to buyers)	<input type="checkbox"/>	47.8%	88
buyers – the people who buy and move into the new homes	<input type="checkbox"/>	4.9%	9
taxpayers – the residents of the surrounding county or city who will own the streets, pipes and parks	<input type="checkbox"/>	1.1%	2
all three – the cost divided between developers, buyers and taxpayers	<input type="checkbox"/>	46.2%	85
answered question			184
skipped question			20

8. Comments:

**Response
Count**

 [Hide replies](#)

64

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 1. Increase the costs of new development. Currently new development is too cheap. And even if Developers are charged, this cost is always passed on to the new buyers. But it will make developers think much harder before plowing everything under. | Fri, Oct 16, 2009 3:03 AM |
| 2. The taxpayers are already strapped. If the developers have the money to develop these new housing developments let them pay for it. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:50 PM |
| 3. Tax payers in general should not be forced to pick up the tab for new subdivisions. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:11 PM |
| 4. I'm glad to see you included parks along with the other urban infrastructure because without the open space, the increased density would be much less tolerable! | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 12:31 AM |
| 5. Taxes are already high and bonds add to it | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 8:02 PM |
| 6. Deciding who should pay for for infrastructure should make sure not to disproportionately impact lower income populations. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 6:37 PM |
| 7. This is a controversial question to answer because new development is not very well define. Assuming the development is taking place on the edge of the growth boundary, the buyers/developers should help fund the cost. But new developments within the boundary should be encouraged and paid for by the taxpayers. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 4:19 PM |
| 8. these new communities will be self sustaining. Also balances by taking 20- 100 acres and developing, spreads the taxes among several home, property owners, not the owners who currently own so much un developed land | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 11:36 AM |
| 9. I do not wish to burden myself or my children or my neighbors with taxes that provide infrastructure for distant suburbs. I would rather have my tax dollars improve the roads, sewers and parks in my (broadly defined) local area. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 11:30 AM |
| 10. Existing communities should be funded by taxpayers since they live in them. To transfer funding to new communities would be a disservice to Portland metropolitan residents. New communities should be funded by developers, who will then be forced to incorporate the true costs of development into their | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:34 AM |

100 responses per page

answered question **64**

skipped question **140**

8. Comments:

schemes. Buyers will then also be aware of the actual costs of extending city services to new developments. If this means smaller houses, so be it. Recent nationwide housing problems have demonstrated that we must consider the true value and costs of homeownership. To accommodate population growth, investments should incentive and prioritize development in existing communities to make them denser, such as converting large single-family dwellings into multi-family dwellings or developing apartment buildings on vacant/substandard lots instead of stand-alone houses.

-
11. Do not add land to the urban growth boundary. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:21 AM
-
12. If only it could be this simple. Find ways to spread the burdens and benefits to all three -- and find ways to make the tax system more equitable. Washington County should be required to have a Park System Development Fee -- they have been negligent in their duty to citizens in that part of the region by not having one during our biggest building booms -- as a result they are looking to Beaverton and regional taxpayers to pick up the tab and provide parks and natural areas to their citizens through their own higher property taxes. This is ridiculous. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:50 PM
-
13. This is the answer which seems most fair, except then the buyer is really paying twice since the developer passes the costs onto the buyer. It seems there should be something in place so the developer pays a portion of the infrastructure out of his profit. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:39 PM
-
14. Obviously, developers and buyers should shoulder the brunt of the development costs, but people who don't want their communities changed by greater development will benefit from these new communities and should be happy to pay for that protection. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 5:50 PM
-
15. Pay as you grow is the correct policy, not degrading our existing quality of life and charging us for it. We cannot sustain all these people. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 4:56 PM
-
16. There should be a pay as you go system. New development should pay for most of the cost of infrastructure expansion Tue, Oct 13, 2009 1:54 PM
-
17. keep existing farmland - don't convert to residential or commercial or industrial Tue, Oct 13, 2009 1:10 PM
-
18. The incentive should be to build sustainable communities that are compact. There should be no government subsidies of unsustainable suburban expansion. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:46 AM
-
19. Although I strongly believe developers need to bear the brunt of the costs, I also believe that there will be times that taxpayers must pay for a portion of the costs Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:17 AM

100 responses per page

answered question 64

skipped question 140

8. Comments:

as well, especially relating to parks and other non-essential but quality-of-life related investments.

-
20. Growth should pay for the demands of growth! Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:48 PM
-
21. If the developers pay the cost that gets passed on to Buyers the lesser the cost of existing more urban areas which would relieve urban blight and renewal would be paid for by Buyers. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 11:42 AM
-
22. I would like to see Tualatin-Sherwood become a highway between Hwy 99 & I-5 not just a 2-lane street as it is currently. Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:41 AM
-
23. In order of priority - taxpayers both busines and residential should pay for policy and planning efforts, developers should fund infrastructure costs Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:16 AM
-
24. All benefit Sun, Oct 11, 2009 5:29 AM
-
25. Please don't ignore schools in your calculations. Roads, sewer systems, drinking water systems and parks are great, but new development requires building new or adding on to existing schools. The recent legislation passed by the legislature allowing development charges is only part of what is needed to fund this essential service. Metro can - and should - play a leadership role in funding construction of schools to meet anticipated growth. Sat, Oct 10, 2009 7:09 PM
-
26. I would be a willing taxpayer of divided fees if it would achieve more density and preserve open space and farm land. Sat, Oct 10, 2009 11:46 AM
-
27. Costs for roads, sewer systems, drinking water systems and parks should be part of the true cost of developement. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:21 AM
-
28. Fix the bridges!!! Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:19 AM
-
29. We should not be building new communities. Density is key to sustainability. Stop building roads!!! The car is ruining society and building new roads only encourages people to continue this unsustainable behavior. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:00 AM
-
30. This last question is tough. I think developers stand to have the most financial gains and would like them to share that profit with others - however, if they just pass on the costs to buyers, then my next best option is for the cost to be shared among all. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 9:31 AM
-
31. with developers and buyers paying the upfront installation costs and taxpayers paying for maintenance of these investments. Fri, Oct 9, 2009 9:06 AM
-

100 responses per page

answered question **64**

skipped question **140**

8. Comments:

32. The developers will build more houses than needed if given the room and budget. If they want to try to turn a profit on our land by rapidly building real estate then they should have to pay for the systems required for their housing developments. Thu, Oct 8, 2009 9:48 PM
-
33. Under no circumstances should taxpayer foot the bill to develop infrastructure in new residential neighborhoods in UGB expansion areas. Wed, Oct 7, 2009 8:33 PM
-
34. I agree that developers should pay development costs (which in reality means that the buyers pay), but to the extent that taxpayers outside new developments benefit, they should not be exempt from sharing in the costs, but I chose "developers" because I think it makes sense to think about the costs up front rather than simply look to taxpayers to foot the bill. Wed, Oct 7, 2009 11:21 AM
-
35. It won't be easy saying no to the developers, because they have all the money. It will take a strong moral backbone to fight the pro-expansion forces. Sun, Oct 4, 2009 3:29 PM
-
36. Developers make money hand off fist wasting valuable farmland because it's easier for them to make a quick buck, also, regulation of already developed land tends to be more restrictive. Developers want to do what ever they want with no responsibility for the results for the unchecked greed on society or the roads, sewers, drinking water. Sat, Oct 3, 2009 10:57 AM
-
37. If developers have to pay, they will be more attentive to the cost and feasibility of possible projects. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:21 AM
-
38. The fees need to be very high. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:33 PM
-
39. My actual choice would be the two-developers & buyers... Tue, Sep 29, 2009 12:46 PM
-
40. The developers should be pay the improvements of the road and should not be allowed to pass expenses on to the buyers..I feel that most developers are money driven instead of what the community would look like after..I feel that not enough planning are done... Tue, Sep 29, 2009 5:38 AM
-
41. The developers and the buyers. The developers make a profit, they can't if they don't pass their costs to the buyers. Taxpayer should not pay for new development. Their taxes should go to existing needs. Mon, Sep 28, 2009 3:50 PM
-
42. Example: Existing residents should help pay for parks since they may want to use them also. Just like the people want to drive into helvetia area now, or ride bikes on rural roads. Mon, Sep 28, 2009 7:05 AM

100 responses per page

answered question 64

skipped question 140

8. Comments:

43. New development creates new strains on existing infrastructure, so I believe it must bear the cost of these improvements. Some improvements have little benefit for existing taxpayers nearby - for instance a new community of 'cul de sac' streets don't allow for cross traffic, so the roads are basically only useful to the new residents. Sat, Sep 26, 2009 10:05 AM

44. I believe developers(and ultimately buyers) should pay for new infrastructure development with one caveat: developers who build infill should receive some subsidy for increasing density. Wed, Sep 23, 2009 8:29 AM

45. I have lived here 58 years. Paid my taxes, and suffered the poor condition of roads as traffic has increased. I should not have to pay for expansion that developers make a profit from. I don't mind paying a portion as I am a road user also... but the developers should bear the major cost Mon, Sep 21, 2009 5:28 PM

46. While I say all three the brunt of costs should be put on developers and buyers. Mon, Sep 21, 2009 9:56 AM

47. Developments frequently reflect the needs of landowners and government policy-makers rather than the residents who will pay for them. It's about time developers were required to pay their fair share of infrastructure necessitated by their developments. Sun, Sep 20, 2009 9:57 PM

48. Not necessarily divided equally between the three groups, though. The taxpayer share should be smaller than what the others pay. Sun, Sep 20, 2009 9:07 AM

Many of the existing Regional Centers and Town Centers could provide a lot more housing and jobs with a modest investment to upgrade the infrastructure -- compared to the huge financial investment required to prepare new land for development. There are also lots of opportunities to RE-develop existing industrial land already within the urban growth boundary.

49. Massive Condo development without planned access to schools - as seen along Halsey near the Edgefield - is really stupid! Help the regions small towns improve the balance of community-driven improvements for self-determination for quality of life, even if it means slowing the the pace of developer-driven new neighborhoods. Sun, Sep 20, 2009 7:38 AM

50. Developers are raking in huge profits on the back of taxpayers like you and me. These bloated profiteers have absolutely no regard for anything other than their very large bank accounts! Sun, Sep 20, 2009 4:32 AM

51. I believe the cost should be spread amongst all three, however I believe the taxpayers ought to be able to veto adding new community development if the current infrastructure would need considerable upgrading caused by additional Sat, Sep 19, 2009 6:36 PM

100 responses per page

answered question 64

skipped question 140

8. Comments:

new community development, not just additional new infrastructure to support the new community. And a geological, runoff, and stormwater drainage study should be accomplished and published before any such development.

-
52. The people who will benefit should pay. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 4:12 PM
-
53. I hate it when citizens bear the burden of taxes for building and infrastructure stuff that makes corporations profits. Corporate welfare is disgusting -- especially when it compromises the quality of living for citizens. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 3:05 PM
-
54. Using bonds to finance construction of new infrastructure puts some of the cost onto future users. System development charges are also important to insure that new development does not tax existing residents out of their homes and businesses. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 2:04 PM
-
55. Without the infrastructure to support a housing development, developers won't sell the houses. Buyers, on the other hand, probably won't buy a home that does not have access to roads, sewer and water services. Parks make a development more attractive and serve as a selling point for the developer. A nearby park will provide enjoyment for the buyer and may increase the property value. Both developers and buyers benefit, but in different ways. The new roads and parks would be accessible to taxpayers in the surrounding area and would probably be a benefit to them. Therefore, all should share in the cost. Developers can write their portions off as business expenses and should be responsible for the largest part of the cost. Buyers should carry a smaller portion which would be included in the mortgage. Taxpayers would be responsible for the smallest amount. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 1:58 PM
-
56. Developers and taxpayers Sat, Sep 19, 2009 12:36 PM
-
57. If people have to pay the actual cost of living far away from the community where they work, study, shop, and play then people will begin to realize the actual cost of spreading ourselves out so far. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 8:46 AM
-
58. I don't mind paying my fair share, accent on share. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 1:31 AM
-
59. I support using financial incentives for developers with regard to low water use designs - dense but quality housing - park, garden and greenspace set asides Thu, Sep 17, 2009 4:07 PM
-
60. Don't change the farmland, where will you grow your crops? Thu, Sep 17, 2009 11:49 AM
-
61. Improve the roads that are here, wider, and bike lanes: at the bikers expense! Do not go into land that is NOT developed! Thu, Sep 17, 2009 11:32 AM
-

100 responses per page

answered question 64

skipped question 140

8. Comments:

- 62.** I think we should do everything we can to discourage growth where we are not ready for development or don't want development, which means making the developers pay for all new infrastructure for such developments upfront. This will, over the long haul, encourage "the market" to develop in infill areas and to make the developments more compact and human in form. Thu, Sep 17, 2009 9:10 AM
-
- 63.** Why abandon improvements in existing communities? By doing so only exasperates further outward growth, as existing communities will become run down by lack of "city maintenance". Thu, Sep 17, 2009 6:20 AM
-
- 64.** Absolutely developers. There are areas in the Metro area that they have grown rich on and totally destroyed the infrastructure because they were not held accountable for infrastructure improvements. If they try to pass the cost on to buyers, the buyers will make the decision on whether to buy or not. Don't we still have a free market economy? Wed, Sep 16, 2009 6:52 PM

100 responses per page

answered question 64
skipped question 140

Page: Protection of ecological systems

9. The rural reserves are intended to protect natural features from urbanization. However, natural features that fall within an urban reserve must also be protected (per urban and rural reserves legislation).

Given this, is it better it include a significant river, stream, wetland or other natural feature:

	Response Percent	Response Count
in an urban reserve where it can be managed by a city <input type="checkbox"/>	19.7%	34
in a rural reserve where it remains under county jurisdiction, protected from urbanization? <input type="checkbox"/>	80.3%	139
	<i>answered question</i>	173
	<i>skipped question</i>	31

10. Comments:

**Response
Count**

 [Hide replies](#)

72

- | | | |
|-----|--|----------------------------|
| 1. | As long as cities can't develop significant river, stream, wetland, or other natural features, I tend to believe that neighbors will protect them better. | Fri, Oct 16, 2009 3:05 AM |
| 2. | THIS QUESTION HAS FAR TOO MANY RAMIFICATIONS AND NUANCES TO BE ANSWERED IN AN EITHER OR FASHION | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:57 PM |
| 3. | Hydrologic systems are large enough you need the larger jurisdiction, but naturally have the cities involved in the process. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 1:12 PM |
| 4. | This question is misleading. County jurisdiction provides no protection from urbanization and the county regularions are usually more lax than cities' and enforcement rates are lower. Our regional cities have great environmental services departments and provide valuable jobs. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 5:50 AM |
| 5. | Boy, that's a hard one -- since I think some, but not all, cities might do as good or better a job of protecting the natural resource as some of the counties do or will in the future. | Thu, Oct 15, 2009 12:33 AM |
| 6. | Not sure | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 6:38 PM |
| 7. | Generally I think that if natural features are held in an urban reserve, they may eventually have to compete with other features of the urban landscape and may end up losing their protection in favor of urban growth (such as creating more housing, office space, etc.). If they are kept in rural reserves, I feel that they are less likely to be sacrificed to things possibly more desirable to city councilmen (i.e. sacrificing wetlands to build waterfront housing). | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 5:44 PM |
| 8. | There is ample trees, and water ways that should be worked with and around as large land tracts are being developed, so easy to include at the time. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 11:37 AM |
| 9. | When it comes to the watershed, it seems that limiting development near the natural feature is important (due to runoff issues, etc.). Although it might be protected to some degree in an urban area, will the same kind of buffers be put in place as are possible in a rural setting? | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 11:33 AM |
| 10. | The mix of urban and relatively wild landscape is what distinguishes Portland (and Oregon) from many other parts of the US. This mix is well worth protecting and enhancing. | Wed, Oct 14, 2009 11:31 AM |

100 responses per page

answered question 72

skipped question 132

10. Comments:

11. This is a difficult question. If it is a very sensitive ecological feature it should be preserved in a rural reserve. However, natural features can (and arguably should) exist in urban areas. The Willamette River, for instance, is a major natural feature in an urban area that multiple cities and counties, urban and rural, should be responsible for protecting. Urban areas should not be concrete landscapes devoid of natural features and where they exist those features need to be protected. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 9:38 AM
-
12. Metro's own reports show that most development can be contained within the current UGB, therefore concluding that there is no justifiable reason to significantly expand any UGB or preserve. Wed, Oct 14, 2009 6:57 AM
-
13. This is a bit of a false choice since so much of WA Co is unincorporated where urban development is happening -- there just aren't the cities there to be in control of protecting these resources. Nonetheless, err on the side of protection of resources from urbanization. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:51 PM
-
14. I don't know which would be better. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 5:51 PM
-
15. Totally depends upon the stream. Washington County is terrible at protecting watersheds, as proven by the downstreamers' lawsuit against them several years ago--an urban government might be more enlightened. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 4:58 PM
-
16. do not expand urban reserves Tue, Oct 13, 2009 1:11 PM
-
17. This kind of thing should be considered on a case by case basis. In the case of a feature like the Tonquin basin that is easily connected to a massive rural reserve, that is clearly the preferred treatment. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:48 AM
-
18. County governments have historically been oriented towards agriculture and natural resource management, therefore I believe they have the best possibility to protect these areas in the future. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 11:18 AM
-
19. I think it depends on the size of the natural feature and its importance to the local as well as regional ecosystem. This is a very difficult question to definitively answer one way or another. Some should be in urban boundaries and some should not. Tue, Oct 13, 2009 9:37 AM
-
20. Given the government's track record in this state (the majority of the population does not trust any gov't agency - we've seen eminent domain used to force one property owner to sell his land to another individual for a shopping mall), "protected from urbanization" is just a play on words to be twisted to fit whatever government wants at that time. Government does not play by the rules it creates, Tue, Oct 13, 2009 8:07 AM

100 responses per page

answered question 72

skipped question 132

10. Comments:

it only forces those rules on people.

-
- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 21. This totally depends on the natural feature since some features could be enhanced by either method | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 7:32 PM |
|---|---------------------------|
-
- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 22. It is important that the cities integrate these areas as part of their land use planning process with enforcement at the watershed or county level. In the cities these are urban amenities and need to be treated accordingly sometimes as fully protected but more often as part of urban parks, trails, and open space. | Mon, Oct 12, 2009 10:40 AM |
|---|----------------------------|
-
- | | |
|---------------------|----------------------------|
| 23. Not sure | Sun, Oct 11, 2009 11:01 PM |
|---------------------|----------------------------|
-
- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 24. I am assuming that management by a city would allow better coordination with the city Bureau of Development and possibly allow for recreation opportunities through the Bureau of Parks. | Sat, Oct 10, 2009 11:49 AM |
|---|----------------------------|
-
- | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------|
| 25. none | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:20 AM |
|-----------------|---------------------------|
-
- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| 26. I would advocate it be under the jurisdiction that has the most power to protect it completely (i.e. not just protect a stream, but also protect the tributaries that feed it.) Whichever entity can do that, I would support their having jurisdiction over the feature in question. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 11:20 AM |
|--|---------------------------|
-
- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 27. We have to balance the protection aspect of rural reserves with the usability of them - as urban residents live more closely, we will need spaces where we can get outside and enjoy those natural features. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 10:11 AM |
|---|---------------------------|
-
- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 28. Who has the resources to manage it? | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 9:32 AM |
|--|--------------------------|
-
- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 29. urbanization is inevitable, thus helping municipalities protect natural features and holding them accountable for doing so is a wise strategy to ensure our natural features remain protected. | Fri, Oct 9, 2009 9:08 AM |
|---|--------------------------|
-
- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 30. Office buildings placed on top of wetlands are visible from HWY-26. It obviously has a negative impact on wildlife. | Thu, Oct 8, 2009 9:49 PM |
|--|--------------------------|
-
- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 31. Significant natural features tend to transcend municipal boundaries, therefore, the counties have a much more holistic view of these system than a collection of cities making budget decisions independently of one another. | Wed, Oct 7, 2009 8:36 PM |
|--|--------------------------|
-
- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 32. Putting a natural feature such as a stream, its headwaters and associated wildlife habitat in an urban reserve will destroy the functioning system as development occurs, particularly where the wildlife habitats are connected to a broader system, such as in Multnomah County's western slopes, where the elk herds travel to and from the coast range, for example, and where the | Wed, Oct 7, 2009 11:45 AM |
|---|---------------------------|

100 responses per page

answered question 72

skipped question 132

10. Comments:

headwaters and riparian lands form part of a broader ecosystem. Once housing encroaches into the system, the wildlife corridors will be endangered, stream quality will be degraded, and the natural systems that we want to preserve will be disrupted. Thinking that we can protect natural features in an urban environment, cut off from the rural landscape, is a rationalization that we should avoid. We should do what we can within the urban areas to preserve natural features, but once we have committed the surrounding land to urban uses, the stream and its associated riparian lands and headwaters are essentially cut off from the natural system and will inevitably degrade, losing much of their value as wildlife habitat. The idea that a city can protect a natural feature from urbanization is essentially a contradiction in terms.

33. The UGB should be drawn along the outer side of riparian areas and other natural features that cannot be used for development. This would provide a "green belt" around each city and help with the conflict between urban and rural uses. Cities should be asked to adopt a planning zone for such natural areas that would guarantee that this edge area would not be developed. Tue, Oct 6, 2009 12:49 PM

34. Rivers, streams and wetlands should remain in rural areas. If you must, build a park that is maintained near the natural feature for people to enjoy, but do not surround natural areas by streets, buildings, or industry. Mon, Oct 5, 2009 3:29 PM

35. I think a city's parks department might have more resources and expertise to manage natural areas and possibly make them accessible to the public in a limited way that would not harm the habitat or wildlife. I do not feel certain about this. Sun, Oct 4, 2009 7:14 PM

36. County is more likely to consider agricultural issues, wildlife, and scenery than the city would. Sun, Oct 4, 2009 3:32 PM

37. Once the rural protections are removed, it's just a matter of time until a developer finds a way to develop-exploit it. Sat, Oct 3, 2009 10:59 AM

38. I assume city's can't be expected to be as assiduous about preserving natural features when it is not in the city's immediate political or economic interest, so shield these features as much as possible for pressures. Fri, Oct 2, 2009 7:23 AM

39. The county must truly protect the reserve. Thu, Oct 1, 2009 6:34 PM

40. Not sure. It would depend on the political views of the County Commissioners vs. those of City councillors with regard to environmental protection. Tue, Sep 29, 2009 11:04 PM

41. I would like to see lots more natural areas, and ones that can connect together so wildlife can move! I live in a wooded area, and all the wildlife is getting Tue, Sep 29, 2009 12:49 PM

100 responses per page

answered question **72**

skipped question **132**

10. Comments:

squeezed and prolific. Anyone trying to grow a garden or just flowering landscapes are having it decimated by deer, this only in the last couple of years.

-
42. An independent study on what are the natural reserves or not should be done...Thirty five years ago, I used to count one to 4 peregrine falcons on the telephone poles, now I will be lucky to see one in a week... Tue, Sep 29, 2009 5:42 AM
-
43. It depends on the specifics of each situation. We need the best management of nature as possible. Mon, Sep 28, 2009 3:52 PM
-
44. There are many cities across the world that have rural areas protected within a city... Have you heard of Portland, Oregon - they have a beautiful area call Forest Park? Fri, Sep 25, 2009 7:35 PM
-
45. I have no basis/background for answering this question. Wed, Sep 23, 2009 8:30 AM
-
46. Rivers and other natural features need to be protected at all costs. We all should pay to keep them clean. Tue, Sep 22, 2009 6:23 PM
-
47. By far the streams, creeks, parkways and open space is much better protected and managed under cws, metro and city. Being lock out for 50 years especially areas abutting UGB, (close proximity) need this protection...it is a false application to think otherwise. Tue, Sep 22, 2009 10:08 AM
-
48. Designation and protection of natural features should be required in both urban and rural areas regardless of county or city location. Mon, Sep 21, 2009 5:31 PM
-
49. Protect it from the start! Mon, Sep 21, 2009 9:58 AM
-
50. Taxes from city residents invariably pay for counties, but these taxpayers seldom have any say in how their taxes are spent. Sun, Sep 20, 2009 10:00 PM
-
51. I don't care who manages streams, etc as long as they are protected and the natural environment is enhanced. This is not an either/or choice! Sun, Sep 20, 2009 7:02 PM
-
52. The problem is that some cities are better prepared to manage such areas than others. The same is true of counties. So, it's hard to make a general statement as to which is the better way to go. Sun, Sep 20, 2009 9:08 AM
-
53. I don't think land-owners outside of Gresham believe the County is planning to protect ANY land.
Zoning changes is increasing BAD building and forcing small farmers to sell. They tell me the County had pretty much told them to plan to move. Land Divisions adjacent to farms radically increases Taxes, and neighbors are FORCED to sell. Developers know this and plan parthwork land parcel buys and

100 responses per page

answered question 72

skipped question 132

10. Comments:

ugly, un-sustainable infill to follow. This must change! There is room in Parkrose for Co-Housing with Green-Values. Facilitate new community opportunities that use _privacy lots_ with on-site riparian reserve features and gardens. Flag lots COULD become mini oases.

-
- 54.** At the METRO level, adopt the more recent (draft) federal definition of wetlands and riparian areas than the words presently used by Corps of Engineers and DSL. These definitions will better protect the natural features and functions of streams from impacts of urbanization. Sun, Sep 20, 2009 6:53 AM
-
- 55.** I'm not sure on this one. I chose what I did because I prefer local control and could see this might add to sprawl, but ultimately it matters less to me who does it than that it is done. Water is our life blood Sun, Sep 20, 2009 6:32 AM
-
- 56.** It depends on the area. I think the Tryon Creek is a great example of a park that is well run and well used. It is large enough and natural enough to have a positive impact on wildlife and also education and public use. If as an urban reserve, the park would have access to more resources and a solid protection, then that's fine. I don't know the ramifications or differences of each type of reserve. Sun, Sep 20, 2009 6:10 AM
-
- 57.** Save our wild places--protect them from urbanization! Sun, Sep 20, 2009 4:37 AM
-
- 58.** City commissioners, all good intentions aside, never really seem to understand the historical, environmental or community significance of wetlands, riparian reserves, waterways, or other natural features often allowing mitigation which eventually destroys the wetlands, reserves, waterways or features never to be reclaimed. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 6:41 PM
-
- 59.** this question is crappily done... just so you know. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 4:01 PM
-
- 60.** They both need protection. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 4:00 PM
-
- 61.** Ask the Sierra Club and Audubon Society about this. The people who have devoted their careers to protecting natural places know the history and legal logistics about this better than me. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 3:07 PM
-
- 62.** Rivers, streams and wetlands in urban areas are usually protected, but because of their surroundings, the water quality decreases and the whole basin is affected. It is more desirable to keep significant water bodies in a rural setting. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 2:07 PM
-
- 63.** I don't think I know enough about the distinction to give an informed answer to this question. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 8:48 AM
-

100 responses per page

answered question 72

skipped question 132

10. Comments:

64. Washington County needs to upgrade floodplain & headwaters protection. Low Impact Development Standards that prevent stormwater runoff need to be mandated. Oregon Department of Agriculture needs to step up and protect our rivers and streams. UGB expansion should be conditional on no growth in effective impervious area. Sat, Sep 19, 2009 8:42 AM

65. A general comment - I lived in Phoenix for 17 years and watched in horror as the city grew uncontrolled in every direction. It leapfrogged across the counties causing farms and livestock to be forced out from the complaints of new developments. It has turned the area into LA west clogged with traffic and no significantly livable new neighborhoods. Thu, Sep 17, 2009 5:49 PM

66. until social evolution has advanced much further than current culture urban waterways are always less protected than rural simply because it's human impact that destroys habitat - that this will not always be the case is my optimistic vision for the future of humanity but we are not there yet Thu, Sep 17, 2009 4:12 PM

67. Leave the Farmland alone, and quit building!! Use the land already 'pulled' into the UGB and leave the foxes, deer and other wild animals in the Rural areas. And leave us alone, having lived here, the 3rd generation, at 66 years, on the same place. You took my Grandfather's name off the road, so please don't take the land! My roots are deep! And no one seems to care? Thu, Sep 17, 2009 11:38 AM

68. Involve the local watershed councils in this decision. Thu, Sep 17, 2009 10:54 AM

69. From my understanding, such features in a rural reserve are more likely to be protected. In urban/suburban areas, there is always pressure for development (and job creations). Keeping these features in rural or even forest reserves will ensure that these are not mistreated by development. Minimizing our carbon and environmental footprint is going to be necessary in future years since no other state is protecting their resources. Our farmlands may have to feed more than just local in future years, and we must prepare for this now to minimize its impact when the time comes. Thu, Sep 17, 2009 9:13 AM

70. Including a river, stream, wetland or other natural feature in an urban reserve will open it to heavy pollution. Oil, Smut, gasoline, rubber, etc will all end up in the river or stream by runoff from roads and sewers. Which is unacceptable and the cities have proven to be inefficient at controlling this. Thu, Sep 17, 2009 6:23 AM

71. Again, while I chose "in an urban reserve," I think either solution could work. Thu, Sep 17, 2009 4:49 AM

72. Duh..... Wed, Sep 16, 2009 6:52 PM

100 responses per page

answered question 72

skipped question 132